

The Philanthropist.

VOLUME VI. NO. 9.

CINCINNATI, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 11, 1841.

WHOLE NO 269

THE PHILANTHROPIST,

PUBLISHED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE OHIO STATE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
Main st., between 4th & 5th, East side.
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

SAMUEL A. ALLEY, Printer.

TERMS.—TWO DOLLARS a year in advance. Letters on business should be directed to the Publishing Agent, WILLIAM DEARLOVE—those relating to the editorial department, to the Editor.—In all cases post paid.

Terms of Advertising.
one square of 16 lines, or less, one insertion, \$0 50
" " each additional insertion, 0 30
" " for 6 months, without alteration 5 00
" " " with alterations, 6 00
" " " 1 year, 10 00
Advertisements of 20 per cent. on all advertisements occupying one half, two-thirds or an entire column.

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE.

We find the following letters in the columns of the *Philanthropist*. They originated, as will be seen, in an anti-slavery petition, consigned to Col. Richard M. Johnson, by Thomas Earle, Esq. Each writer sustains his side with ability; but Thomas Earle's argument is admirably clear and conclusive.

CITY OF WASHINGTON,
U. S. SENATE CHAMBER, Jan. 4, 1841.
Thomas Earle, Esq.

Sir:—Your letter of the 26th ultimo is received, enclosing a petition signed by yourself and thirty-seven others, asking Congress "to take all constitutional and proper means for so amending the laws or Constitution of the Union as to abolish all requisition upon the people and public officers of the nation, and of this State, (Pennsylvania,) to aid, assist, or participate in holding human beings in slavery;" which petition you request me to present to the Senate.

I suppose you are aware that I have given publicity to your refusal to present any petition to the Senate, touching the subject of domestic slavery, either in the States or in the District of Columbia; and on this subject I am willing that my sentiments shall be universally known.

The Constitution of the United States, Art. 4, Sec. 2, Clause 3, provides that "no person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor be due." The laws, therefore, of which the petition speaks, are constitutional provisions, and cannot be abolished by Congress; the only remedy would be to alter the Constitution; and if that could be effected, it would be the destruction of that sacred instrument, and the tearing asunder of the bonds of our union. When our present government was constituted, the same clashing interests existed upon this subject which are now felt; and it was in the spirit of compromise that the question was settled. Each State reserved to itself the power of pursuing its own policy in relation to involuntary servitude, and all stipulated that no State should become the receptacle for those who might flee from such servitude. If, now, the spirit of conciliation is so far lost, that this compromise is to be disturbed, it must be obvious to every reflecting mind, that the union will cease to exist. Without this compromise we should never have been a confederated nation; and without its continuance we shall become as many distinct nations as we are States; and there exists a deep motive in the bosom of every one within or without the limits of our confederacy, who is hostile to republican government, to join in this hue and cry against domestic slavery; in order to hurry us on to ruin.

The associations of citizens in different States under the appellation of abolitionists, are perfectly harmless so long as they confine their views to their own States; but when they extend their action to other States, they become dangerous; for in the powers which the States have reserved to themselves, they are as foreign to each other in their choice of policy, as though they were distinct nations.

But what is the object of such interference? Every person must perceive that it is not with the least prospect of obtaining the end proposed. An amendment to the Constitution would require the votes of twenty States; and it is obvious to all, that no State in which slavery is legalized, would sanction a change, for no other purpose than that of debarring themselves from the power of recovering their property, by rendering their servants secure from apprehension in other States. I will not so impeach the understanding of any of the petitioners as to suppose that one among them entertains a hope of succeeding in such a measure.

Is the object to meliorate the condition of the slave? Every movement of the abolitionists has produced the opposite effect, and in the nature of things must continue so to do. Is it the hope of effecting the abolition of slavery? If any measure can tend to bind the slave more permanently to his lot of servitude, those which are pursued by the abolition societies are, of all others, most calculated to destroy the last gleam of hope for that race.

As their proceedings have one threatening tendency, it is difficult to discover any other object than that of a dissolution of the federal compact. It is known as certainly as any thing can be known, that the proprietors of slaves will not suffer those who have no such property to sacrifice, to wrest from them what they have ever held under the sanction of law and the Constitution. They have shown no disposition to interfere with the regulations of other States, and they will suffer no foreign interference with their own; and if it shall ever happen that Congress shall so far transcend its constitutional powers, as to attempt to wrest from any portion of the citizens of the United States this species of their property, or to deprive them of their constitutional right of reclaiming their servants when they become fugitives by fleeing to other States, it will at once terminate this confederacy. Those who are taking the most active part in measures so threatening to the peace of our happy country, seem regardless of such a result. It must be obvious to them that the violation of the compact settled by the Constitution, is dangerous to our prosperity and to our existence as a nation, and incompatible with the dictates of honor. It has already inflicted a serious injury upon both the master and the slave; and they

cannot but know that if their measures prevail, our union must be dissolved. With me, abolition and disunion are identical terms to this extent. Within the brief period of a few years, I have seen the spirit of abolitionism, confined at first to the District of Columbia, pass with hasty step to the prohibition of the slave trade between the States, to the abolition of slavery and the slave trade within the territories, to the non-admission of new States providing for this domestic policy, to the exclusion of Texas upon the same ground, to the recognition of the independence of Hayti, to the enactment of naturalization laws to admit people of color—not only to become citizens, not only to hold property, but—to vote at our elections; and now I see in the petition enclosed, a direct proposition to alter a portion of the Constitution relative to this compromise, and to repeal the laws made in conformity to that provision. Our country has been agitated, and at times almost convulsed, with political strife, and with every political question both of war and of peace: these were legitimate subjects, naturally growing out of our democratic form of government, and in all these discussions, every party professed to adhere most sacredly to our federal Union, with a tenacity highly creditable to the intelligence and patriotism of the people. No party ever dared to put the Constitution at defiance. In no instance has my confidence been shaken in the integrity of the nation. But here is a subject perpetually agitated, which, regardless of the compromise entered into by the fathers of our independence—those who fought and bled for it—and confirmed by the solemn obligation of the Constitution which every citizen is bound, and every officer sworn to maintain, regardless of every consequence, however appalling to humanity, which must, if persisted in, destroy the last hope of man in this world of despotism; modern abolitionism, which, in its origin, created in the bosom of the patriot but pity for the few who seemed willing to agonize this happy community with this subject, has, in a few years, become one of dread, of danger, and of awful foreboding; and it demonstrates the melancholy fact, that misguided sympathy, inflamed by religious enthusiasm, and having nothing to lose itself, as to property, cannot be restrained by the prospect of losing the inestimable blessings, the inexhaustible happiness and innumerable benefits arising from the most perfectly organized and the best regulated government on earth. I shall feel my solemn duty, to the extent of my feeble powers, to oppose its progress and destroy its influence.

What would be the consequence of separation? It requires but little knowledge of human nature to discover that states too heterogeneous in their elements, and too distant in their affections and interests, to harmonize in the happiest political union that the world ever exhibited, could not long maintain peace with each other when that bond was severed. The example of the world confirms this apprehension. The little republics of the ancient world were always at war with each other; the states of Greece could never be restrained by the consideration of their common safety, from bloody wars among themselves. The little sovereignties of Germany, by their desolating wars against each other, have dyed their fields and swelled their streams with blood. And who could anticipate a happier state of things in this country? The elements of war are already kindling in the phrenzied passions which are eternally urging this subject, and if the fatal blow shall be struck to sever the bond of union, it will commence in blood, and in its progress will exhibit scenes of devastation more shocking to humanity than all the feuds of Europe or the vandalism of the world. The responsibility will rest upon those who are sowing the seeds of discord, if such a state of things must happen. Congress has again and again refused to hold jurisdiction of this subject even for discussion upon its merits. Congress, the guardian of the Constitution, and sworn to support it, would, in so doing, be guilty of moral treason against the liberties of the people.

I cannot suppose all who give countenance to these measures are considerate of the consequences; but a mistaken enthusiasm in honest minds may produce effects as direful as wilful error. I have been in the service of my country thirty-six years, and it is my determination to retire with the consciousness of never having done an act which would have the remotest tendency to weaken the bond of our union, or to have participated, with those who profess higher obligations to our country than those imposed by the constitution.

My declining to present the petition does not arise in any degree, from a want of due respect to yourself and those associated with you in it. It is the discharge of a public duty which requires me to return it. It is my disposition at all times, to fulfil the wishes of my fellow-citizens in every thing compatible with the obligations which I owe to my country; and to citizens so respectable in private life, I could not abruptly return the petition without assigning my reasons for so doing. Having given you a hasty outline of my views, you will perceive that, with all the regard I entertain for you personally, I could not consistently present the petition to the Senate. I wish not to invade your right of making your petition, nor do I complain of the manner in which you have exercised it; but I know of no law, nor of any part of the constitution, which requires me to present a petition which I believe to be in its call, repugnant to the constitution and dangerous to the country. It is only in obedience to my own conviction of duty that I decline, and in so doing, I hope you will believe me when I aver that it will ever give me real pleasure to serve you, or any of the petitioners, when I can do so without violating my duty to our common country.

Most respectfully,
R. M. JOHNSON.
TO RICHARD M. JOHNSON,
Vice President, and President of the Senate of the United States.

Sir:—Your letter of Jan. 4th was duly received. In it you decline to present to the Senate of the United States, over which you preside, a petition, praying for such alteration of the Constitution as will abolish all requisition upon the people and public officers of the nation, and of the State, to aid, assist, or participate in holding human beings in slavery. As you have given, and made public, your

reasons for this refusal to present the petition, I propose publicly to reply to them: and I request all editors who have published your letter, to copy this response.

You say, that if the proposed alteration of the Constitution could be effected, it would be the destruction of the Constitution itself, and the tearing asunder of the bonds of our union. If this were a correct opinion, and the fact of its correctness were sufficient reason against making the proposed change, then it would be very proper to urge in Congress this view of the subject, as an argument to show that the prayer of the petition should not be granted; but it is not, in my opinion, an effective argument to justify a refusal to present and consider our petition. If it be so very evident that your view is correct, then there can be no danger that the prayer of the petition will be granted, and no harm in presenting it, and obtaining the decision of Congress upon it. But if it be not perfectly evident that we are in the wrong, and if there be a probability that those who sustain our views will have the best of the argument, then it is a great infringement of our rights as citizens, (however well meaning the mistaken motives which lead to it) to refuse us a hearing before the representatives whom we help to elect, and to compensate, and whose laws we are compelled to obey.

You call the Constitution a sacred instrument. In using this expression, I cannot suppose you mean that its framers were infallible in their political views, inasmuch as a majority of them, I believe, held opinions adverse to your own. I cannot suppose that you mean that the instrument was made so perfect that it could not be improved by change; for, I do not, you approve of the changes effected in the twelve amendments that have been already made, and I know that you are, or at least have been, desirous of further changes, for I have read the record of your votes in favor of such further changes. If you mean that its provisions, while in force, are sacredly to be observed, then I must think that we in framing our petition have conformed to those provisions, and that you in refusing to present that petition, have violated them, and consequently, have yourself infringed the sanctity which you claim for the instrument. The Constitution itself most clearly guarantees the right to alter it, in the manner that we have proposed; and it declares that no law shall be passed to prevent the people from petitioning for a redress of grievances. If the whole Congress combined cannot, even by passing solemn laws, prevent our petitioning, then surely a single member of it cannot, rightfully, without any law to countenance, prevent us from doing so. To prevent our petitions from being presented and heard, is in effect to prevent our petitioning, within the meaning of the Constitution; and such I have no doubt would have been your own opinion, and that of every one who has infringed our claim to be heard, had the question first arisen on a petition, to the object of which you and they had been favorable. I draw this conclusion, because not a single individual who is in favor of the object of the petition, doubts that the refusal to receive it is an infringement of the intent of the Constitution, while large numbers of those who are opposed to its object, coincide with us as to our right to be heard. Where all of those whose ulterior views are favored by a certain construction of an instrument, are agreed as to that construction; and a large portion of their opponents coincide with them, I think we have the best proof that can possibly exist in any disputed case, that the construction is the true one.

You intimate that to make the alteration we propose, would be contrary to the spirit of the original compact. If it were so, that would be no valid reason for refusing to receive, hear, and consider our petition, though it might be advanced as a reason for not granting its prayer. Every petitioner has the exclusive right to judge in the first case for himself, whether the object proposed in his petition be a proper and constitutional one; and it is only after hearing the petition, and the arguments which may be alleged in it, that Congress can rightfully overrule his judgment. The question of expediency and constitutionality is to be decided by Congress after the hearing of the petition, and not before. To prejudge the question either of expediency or constitutionality, and upon such prejudgment to refuse to receive the petition, is, in each case, alike a violation of our sacred rights, and such a violation as but few monarchs have ever had the hardihood to commit.

I am willing to admit that you, and others, who take the like course, suppose that you do not infringe our natural and constitutional rights, because I have learned, by observation, that when men of superior talents and of general good intentions, have once been misled so far as, under ideas of an overruling expediency, to become the advocates of the continued violation of what they admit to be the natural and inalienable rights of man, they will afterwards be ready to adopt as sound, all sorts of absurd reasoning which go to aid in the carrying out of the wrong.

I have said that if our objects were contrary to the spirit of the national compact, even that fact would afford no justification of the refusal to present or receive our petition. I will now add, that our object is, in truth, strictly in accordance with the spirit and intent of the Constitution. The framers of that instrument did intend that it should not be perpetually subservient to the gross oppression and injustice which is embraced even in the mildest species of slavery. They contemplated the extinction of that evil, and the alteration of the Constitution so that it should no longer sanction it. For external evidence of this fact, I will refer you to Weld's pamphlet, entitled, "Power of Congress over the District of Columbia."—For internal, and to my mind all-conclusive evidence, I will refer you to the fact, that the convention which made the Constitution declared one feature of it only to be unalterable, except by unanimous consent, viz: that feature which gives the States an equal suffrage in the Senate; and I further refer you to the still stronger fact, that while the framers of the Constitution gave to slavery and to slaveholders certain immunities which were not to be taken away prior to 1808, they declared that after that year those immunities should be subject to change in the same manner as other parts of the instrument.

Article fifth of the Constitution, after giving the general power to amend by the act of two-

thirds of the Congress and three-fourths of the States, provides "that no amendment which may be made prior to the year one thousand eight hundred and eight, shall in any manner, affect the first and fourth clauses in the ninth section of the first article, and that no state without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The first clause here alluded to is that which authorizes such states as may see fit to import slaves until 1808; and the fourth clause is that which prevents the slaveholding states from being taxed in a greater ratio than that of reckoning five slaves equivalent to three freemen.

If the convention had not expressly restricted the alteration of any part of the Constitution, it might be argued, with some show of plausibility, that there might be alterations proposed contrary to the intent of the amendatory clauses; but when that body explicitly declared what portion shall be unalterable, except by unanimous consent, it did what was equivalent to declaring that all other portions might properly be changed in the ordinary mode; and when they declared that the slaveholding immunities of the instrument should not be changed prior to 1808, they in effect said, "we will give you time to prepare for a change in this respect, but it is our intention that such change shall ultimately be effected, or at least that it shall be deemed proper to effect it, if the requisite vote can be obtained, and it shall be deemed lawful and proper to strive to obtain such requisite vote."

The constitution was formed with a view to advance liberty, and abolish slavery. Some of our southern brethren would now construe it so as to diminish liberty and increase and perpetuate slavery.

You express the opinion, that when the slaveholding compromise is abandoned, "we shall become as many distinct nations as we are states." I cannot see why the twenty states whose vote would be necessary to effect the change should afterwards divide themselves into twenty distinct nations.—Such a result appears utterly improbable. Nor can I see why the remaining six states should dissolve the union in consequence of such change. To suppose they would do so, is to set a low estimate on their justice, prudence, and patriotism. For them to object to the other states doing as they are allowed themselves to do—that is, form their own regulations, according to the dictates of their own consciences in respect to slavery, would be highly unreasonable; and if it were not so, it could not advantage them to dissolve the Union. Such dissolution would impair rather than strengthen their unjust hold upon their slave property. And, moreover, as you have well portrayed, it would subject them to many calamities. I have such confidence in their wisdom as to believe that the picture of the consequences of disunion, which you have drawn, would deter them from the mad experiment.

You have addressed your warning on the subject of disunion to the wrong quarter. It is not we that threaten it. You should offer your arguments to those who do. We should violate our consciences by making concessions of the kind you recommend; but our southern brethren would neither sacrifice their consciences nor their interests by abolishing slavery: on the contrary they would do homage to both. You ask us to make concessions contrary to principle, for the sake of union—why not rather ask our southern brethren to make concessions consistent with principle for the sake of union and harmony and justice. Five-sixths, not to say nineteen-twentieths of the people of the union have an interest opposed to slavery; you ask them to concede this interest, for the sake of harmony, with a small portion who may suppose that they have a contrary interest. Nine-tenths of the people believe slavery to be unjust; you ask them to violate principle, and to commit what they believe to be injustice, for the sake of harmony with one-tenth. Why not ask the one-tenth to yield?

I am convinced that if slavery were abolished in the south, the rise in the value of real estate in five years would more than compensate the price of the slave. Moreover, the improvement in morals, in order, in peace of mind, would be far greater than any pecuniary considerations. Look at the want of energy, industry, science, literature, and improvement in the south compared with the north, and see if you can hesitate as to the advantages. Look at the homicides and other immoralities in public men, judges, and presidents of colleges and literary institutions. Read the accounts of slaves killed by masters, and of masters killed by slaves, and contrast it with the fact, that in six and a half years of freedom in two of the British West Indies, and a two and a half years in the remainder; not a single white man has been killed by one of the African race; and see if you can hesitate as to the just and expedient course.

So great is my attachment to the union, that for the sake of perpetuating that union without any accompanying oppression to be committed by us of the north, I should be willing to waive any question of the strictest right, and see the whole of the public lands appropriated through a change of the constitution, to the extinction of slavery; and such I believe would be the sentiment of a vast majority of the people of the North. But I cannot consent under apprehensions of possible consequences, which I believe to be imaginary, and which if realized at all, will not be so through the fault of those with whom I act, to be a silent and willing participant in what I believe to be the greatest injustice and oppression on the face of the globe.

In advising us to sacrifice our own consciences, and the rights of two millions and a half of human beings, under the apprehensions of what you speak, you do not counsel us to follow the golden rule of doing to others as we would that they should do unto us. You do not advise us to act on the principles which would govern yourself in analogous cases.

If the northern states were to propose the establishment of a monarchy, and threaten a dissolution of the Union, unless the southern people would consent to such establishment, you would advise a refusal on the part of the South at all hazards. And yet there is not one southern man who would not rather become subject to a monarchy than to be made a domestic slave. If the rest of the Union should propose that the present free citizens of Kentucky and Tennessee should be punishable by death, for twelve offences which should not be so punished when committed by other citizens, and

should declare their determination to dissolve the Union if their demand were not conceded, you would advise the citizens of those states to let the Union be dissolved rather than submit to such injustice. Yet you ask us voluntarily to aid in inflicting such injustice on others, under a vague and remote apprehension of a dissolution in case we do not comply. If the rest of the Union should attempt to make all of our free citizens prisoners for life, without liberty of locomotion or of action, except at the will of another individual, you would advise resistance at the expense of dissolution. Yet you ask us to aid in making others prisoners for life, without the commission of a crime on their part, for the fear of a remote and uncertain dissolution. If the rest of the states should propose, under penalty of dissolution, that the citizens of your quarter of the Union should not be at liberty to choose their own occupations, each one for himself, you would advise resistance and certain dissolution, rather than submission. Yet you ask us to inflict this gross wrong on a greater number, for fear of possible disunion. If we should propose that yourselves, your wives and your daughters, should be subject to all imaginable personal violence from the depraved and unprincipled of other states, without having the privilege either for themselves or their relatives, to testify in a court of justice against the violator, you would advise disunion rather than submission. Yet you ask us to inflict, by our own voluntary aid, this outrage upon two and a half millions of people for fear of an ideal disunion.

If we proposed that your citizens should be compelled to relinquish to others one-half their earnings, or to retain no more for each, beyond a peck of corn a week and a scanty habitation than another person, revelling himself in luxury produced by their labor, should voluntarily leave to them, you would advise resistance and voluntary disunion, rather than submission to this wrong. Yet you ask us to be silent participants, without any known termination, in inflicting this wrong, for fear of an imagined dissolution. If we proposed to deprive you of the use of those organs and faculties which God has given you—if we proposed to close against you the book of knowledge, and that to your wisdom should be "at one entrance quite shut out," and that he who should teach your children to read, write, and to study the books of history and of revelation, should be punished "with death," you would be roused to the highest pitch of indignation; you would exclaim—"Give us dissolution, war, monarchy, death itself, rather than such tyranny and degradation." Yet you ask us coolly to aid in committing this wrong upon others for fear that those who wish us to aid in it will withdraw their friendship and association if we do not. If we proposed that your wives, your husbands, your parents and your children, should be forever torn from each of you, whenever it should suit the interests or the caprice of a single individual to do it, you would say, "Give us no union at such a cost."

Thus you ask us to be voluntary partners in inflicting seven different species of enormous outrage upon a population almost equal to that which rebelled against England, on account of wrongs which Mr. Jefferson declared to be not equal in whole ages to one hour of the oppression which you wish us to exercise. You ask us to impose those seven cruel burthens, for fear of dissolution, when you would not yourself, with your friends, submit to a single one of them, if you knew certainly that such dissolution would be the result of a refusal. In doing so, you ask us to violate a rule, which, as Christians, and as honest men, we are bound to observe, leaving the results to Providence.

Will it be said that I have supposed the cases of infliction of these wrongs upon a people who, in consequence of being used to liberty could not bear them with the same ease as those who have been accustomed to endure them from childhood, then I answer, if we were to propose their infliction upon all your children hereafter to be born, you would say, "Give us dissolution a thousand times sooner than the subjection of our posterity to such outrages."

Will it be said that the colored man is inferior in intellect, and therefore can bear these things better than the white man? I answer, without debating the point of the truth of the allegation, that if the northern states should propose that every southern white man, whose intellect, determined by a standard to be applied by southern slaveholders themselves, should not be superior to the average intellect of the slaves, should be enslaved, the south would say, with one accord, give us disunion in preference.

No people on earth are more anxious than slaveholders to avoid slavery for themselves—none so often refer to it as an illustration of the greatest of misfortunes. This is a sufficient answer to all arguments in favor of the happy condition of slaves, as well as to those in favor of our voluntarily assisting to make slaves, or continue as slaves, any human beings.

You urge upon us the duty of conciliation.—We recognize it, and are willing to extend conciliation to all men. But we cannot see the propriety of that conciliation towards one man, which annihilates all conciliation towards another—we cannot see why we should aid one person to inflict imprisonment & stripes, & plunder upon an innocent individual for the mere sake of conciliating the wrong-doer. We think that conciliation is as much due to him who is in the right as to him who is in the wrong. And it is because you ask us to be most unconciliating towards millions, that we decline a voluntary compliance with your demand.

Some of our southern brethren are constantly lecturing us on the value of a union which we have never assailed, while they as constantly threaten to dissolve it themselves. With like incongruity they urge upon us the sacred duty of observing the guarantees of the constitution, while they do not hesitate to violate them on their own part. They have not only in the House of Representatives violated by a standing rule the constitutional right to petition, but, on a late occasion, when we forwarded a petition which was no infringement of that rule, they voted in opposition to the plainest principles of language, fact, and common sense, that it did come within the prohibition. They have passed laws in direct violation of that principle of the constitution which guarantees to the citizens of each state all the privileges of citizens in the several states. And that freedom of speech and of the press which the constitution and their own laws recognize, they have destroyed by Lynch law; and their politicians come on to the north and

in their own cities, claiming for themselves the right to discuss all our institutions, publicly proclaim, that they will hang us on the first tree if we exercise the same privilege in their section of the county which they exercise here.

If we were not extremely forbearing, such things would induce us to do, as some of our brethren of South Carolina have already done—calculate the value of the Union.

I say these things in no unkind or uncharitable spirit. I attribute the evils I speak of, to the system of slavery itself, and not to any peculiar obliquity in those who do the wrong. I freely admit that the north may be as culpable in relation to slavery as the south. It is against the system that we contend, and we hope to do it in all charity, and all reasonable allowances for education, prejudice and circumstances.

You say "there exists a deep motive in the bosom of every one within or without the limits of our confederacy who is hostile to republican government, to join in this hue and cry against domestic slavery, in order to hurry us on to ruin." In answer, I would observe, that both in this country and abroad, so far as I am informed, the opposition to slavery comes far more from those who are friendly to republican and liberal government, and the advocacy of slavery most from those who are monarchial and aristocratic. However that may be, it makes no difference to me who advocates the right; it is my duty to support it, whoever may be the persons or whatever their motives, who do likewise. There are few human beings who are right in all things; and I am therefore always pleased to see those who do wrong in one respect, advocate the right in others, and that thus the wrong-doers work against each other, and each in his turn helps those who support the right. If all wrong-doers were combined to uphold each other, I fear there would be little justice or freedom left on the earth. It therefore gives me great pleasure to see monarchists and aristocrats striving against slavery, and also great pleasure to see slaveholders striving against monarchy, and against all other aristocracy except their own. I am ardently opposed to monarchy and to aristocracy of every species. I believe, however, that aristocracy is generally more oppressive than absolute monarchy; and that of all species of aristocracy, slaveholding is the most oppressive upon its victims. Your opinion on this point may be known, if you will state which you would prefer, to be a slave, or the subject of the most oppressive monarchy or aristocracy in the world.

You speak of the right of each state to regulate its own policy in relation to this matter.—The very object of the petition which we sent you was to secure this right. You say that those who hold slaves "have shown no disposition to interfere with the regulations of other states, and they will suffer no interference with their own." Here I must dissent with you on a question of fact. I think they have both interfered with other states and insisted that other states shall interfere with them. They have procured to be inserted in the constitution a provision which we wish to amend, that does dictate to us our internal policy—one that requires our taxes, our prisons, our judges, and our executive officers to be devoted in our own territory to aid in grievous oppression. If England or Russia should insist, as a condition of amity, on our oppressing every subject of theirs who should flee and pass through our borders, you would resist the claim. Yet you have not been content with the provisions of the constitution, but have sent your ambassadors to our state legislatures and induced them to regulate their internal policy according to your wishes,—not only so, but the minority of the people in South Carolina, Mississippi and Louisiana, ask our citizens to assist with their blood and their treasure, in enabling them to maintain a local dominion and tyranny over the majority in those states.

There are no people on earth so disposed as slaveholders to interfere with the policy of other countries. This is a natural result of the system itself, for slavery is the greatest known interference of one class of men with the rights and interest of others, and those who practice the greater will not be likely to hesitate at the less. As this was true of the slaveholders in the tyrannical republics of Sparta and of Rome, where human beings were required to kill each other for the amusement of the aristocracy, so it is true of the slaveholders of this day. The institutions, religious and political, not only of the northern States, but of England, Mexico, Texas, France, China, and Africa, are the constant subjects of the solicitude and care of our southern slaveholding brethren. They could pass resolutions and furnish money in aid of South America, Texas, Greece, and Poland. They will, through our Secretary of State, request the Pacha of Egypt not to oppress the Jews of Damascus. They would protestantize France, christianize India, and civilize Africa; yet they would deny us the right of attempting by moral suasion to convert themselves to our views of Christianity.

A few years since, in answer to our suggestions, we were asked to point out a mode by which our southern brethren could rid themselves of this evil. Now we can do it most conclusively. Is it desired that the colored population should remain in this country, on the supposition that they are best adapted to fill a southern soil? The example of the West Indies shows that they may be emancipated, and remain with far more safety as freemen than as slaves. Is it desired to encourage their migration out of the union? There is now no necessity to wait for a colony sufficiently extensive in Africa, and for sufficient funds to transport them there. The soil of Guiana offers a more eligible place of settlement, with space for ten times the whole slave population of this nation, and the passage of all will be paid by the people of that country, so anxious are they to receive them. In offering this suggestion, I do not recognize the right to effect compulsory migration.

You speak of the "inestimable blessings, the inexhaustible happiness, and the innumerable benefits arising from the most perfectly organized and best regulated government on earth," and intimate that the support of abolition will endanger them. I believe it to be the only means to secure them, and to render them more perfect. I refer you to an article in the *Washington Globe*, published directly after the date of your letter, in which it is, as I think justly,

* Gov. Calhoun's speech, at Philadelphia.

asserted, that if the abolition agitation goes on, the people of England and of Europe may obtain their liberties by the dissemination of its free principles; but if abolition be suppressed, then monarchy and aristocracy will reign triumphant. This article was from an opponent of abolition. It was in connection with, and through abolition principles, that our independence and liberty were established. The Congress of 1774, unanimously signed a declaration against slavery. The declaration of independence reiterated the sentiment. And the democratic party, to which you and myself have been attached, rose to power and dominion under the guidance of such open and active abolitionists as Franklin, Jefferson, Rush, and Gallatin. When the seductions of office, and the misplaced doctrine of State rights (excellent when truly applied) induced the active men of that party to become the advocates or apologists, or abettors of slavery, the party was overthrown. Slavery is essentially hostile to democratic principles. No concessions can bring the majority of slaveholders to support them. In return for the deviations of Mr. Van Buren and his friends, the majority of slaveholders in every State voted against him. Democracy, to be sustained, must have freedom of speech, and warmth and benevolence of heart. Slavery checks and chills those feelings and actions. When democracy combines with tyranny, the concessions must be on the side of the former. Our public men and papers must not speak too openly and enthusiastically of the natural and equal rights of men, lest the slave should hear of it, and become discontented; or lest the slaveholder should hear of it, and vote against the party. How different is the cold calculating tone of your letter, from the warmth and zeal which you manifested of old times, in contending for justice and equal rights, when you were wont to recommend the establishment and activity of abolition societies! You are now taking a part not congenial to your general character, and I hope not to your feelings. In inviting you to abandon it, I ask you to bear in mind that your party, after its first elevation, was never in the minority till it formed a most unnatural alliance with slavery.

In speaking of the inexhaustible happiness that flows from our system, I suppose you do not take two millions and a half of our oppressed population into consideration. And so, when you speak of your thirty-six years of service to your country, I suppose you mean service to the remaining portion of the people, to the exclusion of the two millions and a half of oppressed. Could you not now afford to devote a few years to the service of the remaining portion? By doing so, you could terminate life with a consciousness of having acted well for your whole country, and not merely for a privileged order.

If you mean (as I presume you do not) to include the two and a half millions among the receivers of those inexhaustible blessings, I must differ from you. My inquiries have convinced me that American slavery is the most oppressive on earth, and that we of the North are full participants in its iniquity. Monarchical slavery, Pagan slavery, Mahomedan slavery, and Catholic slavery, are all milder than the slavery of the professed Protestant Republicans of our own country. That African slavery is far milder, you may be convinced by reading Lander's recent travels. Under the monarchies of France and Denmark, the slaves are instructed, instead of being prohibited from knowledge, as with us. In Mahomedan countries, the slave may acquire learning, and can, by law, cease a new master, if he is oppressed. Under the Spanish monarchy, the slave is assisted by law in acquiring his liberty, while, in our country, the master is restricted from granting it. While we exert ourselves to spread republicanism every where, would it not be well for us to be lenient towards the most oppressed in our land, as are the monarchs of other countries? While our slaveholding Protestants send the Bible and the missionary to the Pagans, Mahomedans, and Catholics, would it not be well for them to conform, as nearly as those people, to the most important precept of Christianity? Slavery has melted away in almost every Catholic country, under the influence of their clergy. But here we find a large portion of the Protestant clergy among its supporters or apologists.

You intimate that the condition of the slave has been rendered worse by the exertions of abolitionists. If it were so, temporarily, I doubt whether that would afford a good argument for your purpose. Moses did not cease to remonstrate with Pharaoh, although his remonstrances temporarily increased the oppressions of the Israelites. I doubt, however, the correctness of your opinion. I do not question that your own slaves, so far as your personal observation could control their usage, have always been mildly treated, in comparison with other slaves, although you would think it hard treatment for yourself, and your friends and relatives, to be put in their condition. Now I do not believe that you have become more oppressive in consequence of the moral admonitions of the abolitionists; and, as to other slaveholders, I have it from such sources as to convince me of the fact, that their treatment has become mitigated within the last ten years. This I derive from information; and, if it were not so, I trust I should have more charity for them than to believe that the reminding them of the principles of Christianity and of republicanism could induce them to depart more widely from those principles; or, if it did so, it would be only under the excitement of the moment.

In conclusion, I would respectfully refer to your vote, which, if I recollect right, you gave in gratitude for the act of Lafayette in supporting the liberties of a distant people by force of arms, and ask you, as a consistent man, to allow us to advocate liberty every where, by argument. I refer to your recent letter, concerning a bankrupt law, in which you treat it as monstrous to imprison a man for debt who is guilty of no crime, and I ask you to carry out your principles, and advocate the liberties of all who are neither criminals nor debtors.

If you yield to the natural impulses of your heart, and to the guidance of the general principles which you have always held, and discard the miserable advisers who will constantly recommend the sacrifice of principle to a false expediency, I doubt not you will soon be found among us, engaged in a cause which I believe must prosper, because founded on the rock of immutable truth, and supported by those who place justice among the first of duties, and who are neither monarchists, aristocrats, nor plotters of disunion.

I remain with respect, your friend,
February 4th, 1841.
THOMAS EARLE.

Kentucky Abolition.
The Louisville Public Advertiser of the 3d inst., says: "We do believe that a Convention now called in Kentucky, clothed with plenary power to remodel the Constitution, the free labor advocates would bear the sway, and provision would be made for the abolition of slavery."

ORDINANCE OF 1787.

The position assumed by "J." in his communications to the Gazette of the 25th June and 12th instant may be briefly stated to be to the following effect:—That by virtue of the 6th article of the ordinance of 1787, Ohio and all the states north-west of the Ohio river, are exempt from the operation, and not bound by the 6th article of the Constitution of the United States further than the thirteen original States are concerned or may be interested. Assuming that on this point, the ordinance of 1787, is virtually superior in its power and operation to the Constitution of the United States. Had we no other guide to a correct and rational conclusion as to the relative powers of the ordinance of '87 and the Constitution of the United States, the will of the people as expressed in the 2d section of the 6th article, of the latter instrument, seems to me, beyond all cavil or controversy, amply sufficient to decide which of the two instruments was the superior. "This Constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, any thing in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding." Ohio was bound by the ordinance of 1787, when she was about forming a constitution and government to embody the principles of that instrument in that constitution and government; but, nevertheless, had there been a principle adopted in the state constitution although in conformity with the ordinance of '87, repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, would not the state constitution have had to give way? There can be no doubt of it. Did not the provisions of the ordinance of 1787 make it an ordinary legislative enactment, and like all other such acts, subject to alteration whenever Congress should think proper to make it? The 4th of the 6 articles of the ordinance provides among other things, "that the said territory and states which may be formed therein shall be subject to all the acts and ordinances of the United States in Congress assembled." But the same article of the ordinance is still more explicit on the supremacy of the "articles of the confederation." "The said Territory and States which may be formed therein shall forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America, subject to the articles of confederation and to such alterations therein as shall be constitutionally made." To bring the ordinance more clearly and completely under the constitution of the United States, the only question necessary to solve is, was the "alteration" in the "articles of the confederation" constitutionally made? On the 21st of February, 1787, just six months before the enactment of the ordinance of '87, a resolution was moved and carried in the Congress of the U. States, in compliance with the wishes of a majority of the States of the Union, recommending a convention to meet in Philadelphia on the 2d Monday in May the next ensuing, "for the purpose of revising the articles of Confederation and reporting to Congress and the several legislatures, such alterations and provisions therein as shall when agreed to in Congress and confirmed by the States render the Federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of government, and the preservation of the Union."—The history of that Convention I imagine is too well known to require more from me, than to say, that at the time and place appointed, the representatives of twelve States out of the thirteen met, and after very protracted deliberations they finally adopted the plan of the present constitution on the 17th Sept., 1787, and in pursuance to certain resolutions prescribing the course to be pursued in obtaining the ratification of several states. A resolution was adopted by Congress on the 28th September, 1787, "That the report (the present constitution) &c. be transmitted to the several legislatures in order to be submitted to a convention of delegates, chosen in each state by the people thereof in conformity to the resolves of the convention made and provided in that case." Conventions were accordingly called in the various States by their respective legislatures, and the Constitution having been ratified by eleven out of thirteen states, Congress on the 13th September, 1788, passed a resolution appointing the first Wednesday in January following for the choice of Electors of President—the first Wednesday in February following for the assembling of the Electors to vote a President, and the first Wednesday of March following as the then seat of Congress, (New York,) the time and place for commencing proceedings under the altered Constitution. On the 30th April following George Washington was sworn into office, and the Government then went into full operation in all its departments. This then was an alteration, constitutionally made in the articles of Confederation; such as was provided for in the fourth article of the ordinance of 1787, and puts, in my humble opinion, the question of the supremacy of the Constitution at rest forever—this was the alteration alluded to in the ordinance of '87. It will be seen it was in actual progress, even whilst Congress was creating the ordinance of 1787, and almost immediately after the adoption of the Constitution by the people, Congress proceeded to adapt the ordinance of 1787 to the Constitution. The Preamble to the act of Congress of 7th August, 1789, says, "whereas in order that the ordinance of the U. States in Congress assembled for the government of the Territory north-west of the Ohio, may continue to have full effect, it is requisite that certain provisions should be made, so as to adapt the same (the ordinance) to the present Constitution of the United States, &c." Although the provision introduced by this act do not bear materially on the question at issue, yet the fact of its being at all necessary to make any one provision so as to adapt the ordinance to the constitution, and that, too, without asking the "common consent" of the people of the North-western Territory, destroys all idea of its supremacy, or indeed of its co-ordinate power. The "common consent" so much and so fondly dwelt on amounts to nothing; it was not at all necessary, it was a mere surplusage, the fourth article providing that the territory, and States which may be formed thereafter, shall be subject to all the acts and ordinances of the United States in Congress assembled, conformable to the articles of confederation, or to such alteration therein as should be constitutionally made—and not a syllable about common consent in it. One of the alterations made in the articles of confederation was as follows: article 4th, third division of section second, provides that "no person held to service or labor in one state under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein be discharged from such labor or service, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." Do the people of Ohio, although guarded by the ordinance of 1787, come under this

provision of the constitution of the United States? There cannot in my estimation be a doubt entertained on the subject, they are bound by it, the sixth article of the ordinance to the contrary notwithstanding. But says "J." there is nothing repugnant, in these two provisions, they are in fact the same nearly word for word. Admitted with one exception, the ordinance was enacted for the people of the North-western territory alone, and not obligatory upon any other portion of the Union. The constitution was ordained not for the thirteen original states, but for all the states that might ever enter the Union, equally obligatory on all without favor or affection. That all acts of Congress passed since the adoption of our present Constitution, and conformable thereto, are of full force and effect upon all and every state in the Union, whether of the original thirteen, or otherwise, cannot I think, be questioned. The language of the sixth article, already quoted is too explicit, and irresistible on this head to admit of a doubt—were it not so, we would have introduced a serious absurdity into our system of Government, viz., the necessity of re-enacting all laws passed since the adoption of the Constitution on the admission of each new state into the Union, or otherwise to exclude them from the operation of those laws.

To give full effect to the fourth article of the constitution, and to place the matter beyond doubt, should any be entertained on the subject, Congress on the 12th February, 1793, (5 years after the adoption of the constitution) passed an act declaring that "when a person held to labor in one of the United States or in either of the territories on the Northwest or South of the river Ohio, under the laws thereof, shall escape into any other of the said states or territories, the person to whom such labor or service may be due, his agent or attorney is hereby empowered to seize or arrest such fugitive from labor and to take him or her before any judge of the Circuit or District Courts of the United States, residing or being within the State, or before any magistrate of a county, city, or town corporate wherever such seizure or arrest shall be made; and upon proof to the satisfaction of such judge, &c., it shall be the duty of such judge or magistrate to give a certificate thereof to such claimant, his agent or attorney, which shall be sufficient warrant for removing the said fugitive from labor to the state or territory from which he or she fled." It will not, I imagine, be contended that Ohio or any of the states formed within the territory North-west of the Ohio, are exempt from the operation of this law of Congress! The fourth article of the ordinance of '87 (I would once more refer to it) furnishes a ready answer to any doubt that might exist on this point—"The said territory and the states which may be formed therein, shall forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States in Congress assembled, conformable thereto"—that is conformable to the articles of confederation, and as I intend to the present constitution of the United States. "J." relies on the 6th article, 1st section of the constitution, to support his theory. So far from that article strengthening his position, it has directly a contrary effect.

All debts contracted and engagements entered into before the adoption of this constitution, shall be valid against the United States under this constitution, as under this confederation." As well might "J." have relied upon the 12th article of the old confederation, adopted before the ordinance of '87 was thought of, to defend his position; for in that article the same in substance is enacted.—Judge Story, in his commentaries on the constitution explaining this clause, uses the following language:—"this clause can be considered in no other light than as a declaratory proposition, resulting from the law of nations and the moral obligations of society, and was probably inserted in the constitution, not only as a solemn recognition of the obligations of the government resulting from national law, but for the more complete satisfaction and security of the public creditors, foreign as well as domestic. The articles of the confederation contain a similar stipulation in respect to bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed, and debts contracted by or under the authority of Congress, before the ratification of the confederation." What then becomes of "J's" implied assertion, that the constitution had any, even the most remote reference, to the ordinance of 1787? Much more might be advanced to show conclusively the untenable nature of "J's" position, the course of legislative action on this subject by Ohio, since she became a state fully recognizing her subjection to the constitution, the same course on the part of all the states North-west of the Ohio. But that I fear I have already trespassed so long on your patience and that of my readers, that I would fain leave "well enough alone." I do so under the impression, may under the conviction, that even should I fail to convince any other, I have at least succeeded in convincing myself, that the constitution of the United States, under which we live, is now, and ever shall be, the supreme law of the land! Anything in "J's" argument—anything in the ordinance of 1787—anything in the Constitution or laws of any State, to the contrary notwithstanding. E. K.

The constitutionality of this law has been continually contested in many parts of the United States—the courts and legislatures of some of the free states having already set it aside.—E. P. H.

The following we added as a postscript to our article republished from the Gazette, in our paper of week before last; and contains as we think a sufficient answer to the article above, over the signature of E. K.

From Cincinnati Gazette.
P. S. Since the foregoing was written, I have seen an article in your paper, the main point in which is—that the ordinance is subject to the Constitution, because the amendment is an alteration or amendment of the articles of Confederation; for, the fourth article of the ordinance itself declares, that "the said Territory, and the States which may be formed therein, shall forever remain a part of this confederacy of the United States of America, subject to the articles of the confederation, and to such alterations therein as shall be constitutionally made."

I have already taken up so much of your paper, that I must dispose of this argument in a summary way.—I say then that the Federal Constitution is not a mere alteration or amendment of the old articles of confederation. It is an entirely new instrument, a complete substitute. Different in its principles from the old compact of union, it was not framed, agreed to, or ratified, in the manner prescribed in the articles of confederation for their own amendment or alteration. The provision of amendment in these articles was, that no alteration should "at any time hereafter be made in any of them," unless such alteration should be agreed to in the Congress of the United States, and be afterwards confirmed by the legislature of any State. But, the Constitution was framed and agreed to in a general convention of delegates from the several States; was after-

wards submitted for confirmation to conventions of the people in the States respectively, not to their legislatures; and contained an article declaring, that "the ratification of nine States," (not every State,) should be sufficient for the establishment of this Constitution, between the States so ratifying the same." Therefore, the present Constitution is not a revised edition of the articles of confederation, with "alterations therein, constitutionally made." If there is still any doubt, suppose the people of the United States in general convention assembled, should project a new form of government, and send it forth to the States for their adoption or rejection; and that this form of government were adopted by all the States; and that throughout the whole transaction, from the first call of the general convention to the consent of the last State, not a single direction in the mode prescribed by the Federal Constitution for its amendment had been complied with.—I ask, whether the new form of government could be called with any truth, an amendment or alteration of the Constitution of the United States—constitutionally made?

Nothing further in your last correspondent's article requires remark; but if this were not so, I have already trespassed enough upon your patience. G. B.

ORDINANCE OF '87

From the Cincinnati Gazette.
MR. EDITOR: A word or two by way of reply to your correspondent, "E. K." and it will be but a word or two, inasmuch as their views generally, have been well met by your correspondent of Wednesday, (G. B.)

With such questions as, that there is no compact in the ordinance, there were not at least two parties to it—or, that if those were competent parties, the compact was never "formally accepted" by one of them, and is therefore invalid—with such questions, I say, I shall have nothing to do. They may have their influence in a subordinate court where a five dollar note is depending, but they ought not to be introduced, and if introduced, ought not to be tolerated at a tribunal competent to decide the weighty matter, we have taken in hand to discuss. Even "A. I. J." who has wasted a good deal of time on them, seems to think they are not all, of much weight—to which opinion, at least, if to no other, he will have the ready assent of all the unbiased and intelligent readers. Leaving then these "rats and mice and all such other small deer," let us come up like honest men to the consideration of the merits of the case—as it will be on these, and these alone, that it will have its ultimately to be decided.

"We the people," both your correspondents seem to think, was quite another thing under the Confederation to what it became on the adoption of the present Constitution. Now they were just the same. The people were the residence of the sovereignty as truly under the confederation as they now are under the Constitution. All the power possessed by the Confederation to accept the northwestern territory, and to enact the ordinance for its government was derived from the people—the same people, politically speaking, that sent delegates to the convention in 1787 to make a new form of government. The people acting through the Confederation, authorized the Congress of '87 to enact the ordinance for the government of their dependency, the northwestern territory. This ordinance consists of two parts—a form of government, and a compact. The form of government was, *quoad hoc*—the Confederation.—The compact was declared to be unalterable, except with the consent of the Confederation and the party who were intended to be benefited by it—the people of the north-western territory.—Thus stood matters on the 13th of July, 1787.

Soon afterwards it pleased we the people, the party of the first part, to change wholly the form of their General Government—and this too, without the party of the second part having any hand in the change. If then the party of the first part introduced into the new form of its General Government, any thing repugnant to the compact—the party of the second part having in no manner consented to it—who will say that this will release it from any part of its obligation to observe the compact? This would be to divest the compact of all its obligatory force, by placing the power to alter or nullify it at any time in the hands of the grantor. It would, indeed, utterly do it away as a compact. Take a plain case: A. B. & C., under limited articles of partnership, make a contract with D., which is to endure for a dozen years. The year after, A. B. & C., finding their old articles too restrictive to carry on business in the most advantageous manner, agree among themselves to terms entirely new, by which they embrace a great variety of new objects and interests—one of which (we will suppose) is repugnant to the terms of the contract with D. Would any court having the least pretension to integrity or intelligence say that D. should suffer loss by the new arrangement between A. B. & C. to which he gave no consent, and that the contract should be nullified? or would it not rather decree a full performance as if A. B. & C. had remained under the old articles? This is a plain case, so plain, that any one can decide it justly. Yet is it the very case about which so much has been written—on which so much learning has been wasted. If there be anything in the Constitution of the United States repugnant to the compact, it is as perfect a nullity, so far as Ohio is concerned—at least till her consent to it is duly obtained, as would be matter in the partnership agreement of A. B. & C. which should attempt to set aside their contract with D. We the people have no more right to violate an agreement entered into for a lawful purpose than any individual has to violate his. Their obligation to observe it is, if any thing, stronger, in proportion as the injury done would be greater.

So much then for the argument of your correspondents grounded on the repugnancy of the Constitution and the compact.

I might safely rest the case here—but I will not. I wish to make it appear to the most unbelieving that my position is the true one.

There is no repugnancy between the ordinance and the Constitution. Limitation is not repugnancy. The people of the North-western Territory—and it does not affect the argument that they have become States—came under an obligation by the compact to deliver up slaves who had escaped from the "original States."—This is not the first place in our history that I have met with *original* prefixed to States. It means something—much. If now we can find out what the Congress of 1787 meant by it, the whole matter I think will be fully solved—and right and duty will be made plain. Original States certainly intends that there were some other States either in being or in expectancy to whom this obligation of the people of the North-western Territory was not to extend. Else why use the word "*original*" at all? Why not simply use the word States? But other States were in the mind of the Congress of '87. These were new States: To new States, then, the obligation of the people of the North-western Territory did not extend. But where were we to go for the "new" States to which the obligation

did not extend. The States that were to be made out of the North-western Territory could not have been meant, because they were the party by whom the duty was to be performed—and besides they had among themselves no slaves, and could, of course, have no runaways to deliver up to another. Where, then, I repeat are we to go for the new States to which the people of the North-western Territory not to be bound in the same obligation they had come under to the "original" States? Not to Louisiana—not to Florida. They did not belong to us then. We had at that time but little thought they ever would. Where then were the new States to be found? Only, I say, where they were to be found—in the large domains of Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia. That these States would be divided was fully before the mind of the Congress of '87; and that out of the division new States would grow up and apply for admission into the Confederation or Union, was also fully before them. Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama are these new States. The very States, (there could be none other,) that were intended to be excluded by the word "*original*" embracing the old States.

A few additional facts and considerations.—Both the parties, from the time the compact was made, have regarded it as valid, without exception. I boldly say that not the smallest particle of evidence contradictory of this assertion can be produced in the legislation of Congress, or of Ohio, or Indiana, or Illinois, or Michigan, or Wisconsin. On every occasion up to the admission of Michigan in 1835, whenever it has been necessary to refer to the compact, it has been referred to as a whole, and as of entire validity. Not the most distant hint can be found that there was any repugnancy between it and the Constitution of the United States. On the contrary, the 6th article in question has been specially recognized since the adoption of the United States Constitution. In "an act for an amicable settlement of the limits of the State of Georgia, and authorizing the establishment of a government in the Mississippi Territory," (approved April 7, 1798) the President of the United States is "authorized to establish therein a government in all respects suitable to that exercised in the territory N. W. of the river Ohio; excepting and excluding the last article of the ordinance made for the government thereof," &c.

In the act of Congress, May 7, 1800, erecting Indiana into a separate territorial government, the whole of the ordinance is recognized.

So in regard to the territory of Michigan, January, 1805, more than two years after Ohio became one of the States of the Union.

The ordinance was also recognized—we speak from memory—in the erection of Alabama into a territory in 1818, omitting the 6th article, as in the case of Mississippi.

I said in a former article, that in 1787, the prevailing sentiment of the country was favorable to emancipation; and that the Convention that formed the United States Constitution, expected that Congress would admit no new State into the Union as a slaveholding State. I submit a few of the multitudinous proofs of this that lie before me, collected together in a pamphlet, entitled "The power of Congress over the District of Columbia."

Jefferson, in his notes on Virginia, written just before the close of the Revolutionary War, says:—"I think a change already perceptible since the origin of the present revolution. The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave is rising from the dust; his condition modifying, and the way, I hope, preparing under the auspices of heaven, for a total emancipation."

In a letter to Dr. Price, of London, who had just published a pamphlet in favor of the abolition of slavery, he further says:—"In 1785, from the mouth to the head of the Chesapeake, the bulk of the people will approve of your pamphlet in theory, and it will find a respectable minority to adopt it in practice—a minority, which for weight and worth of character, preponderate against the greater number." Again:

"This is the next state to which we may turn our eyes for the interesting spectacle of justice, in conflict with avarice and oppression—in which the sacred side is daily gaining recruits. The College of William and Mary, since the remodelling of its plan, is the place where are collected together all the young men in Virginia, under preparation for public life. They are under the direction, most of them, of Wythe, one of the most virtuous of characters, and whose sentiments on the subject of slavery are unequivocal. I am satisfied if you could resolve to address an exhortation to those young men, with all that eloquence of which you are master, that its influence on the future decision of this important question would be great, perhaps decisive."—Jefferson's *Posth. Works* vol. 1. p. 268

In 1785, the New York Manumission Society was formed. John Jay was its first President. He was succeeded in this office by Alexander Hamilton.

In 1787, the Pennsylvania Abolition Society was formed. Dr. Franklin, warm from the discussions of the Convention that formed the Constitution of the United States, was elected President.—Dr. Rush, Secretary.

In 1789, the Maryland Abolition Society was formed. Among its officers were Judge Chase and Luther Martin.

In 1790, the Connecticut Abolition Society was formed. The first President was Dr. Stiles, President of the Yale College; Secretary, Judge Baldwin, the father, it is believed of Mr. Baldwin who has so lately distinguished himself in the Amistad case.

The same year the Virginia Abolition Society was formed. In a memorial sent to Congress, it speaks of slavery as "not only an odious degradation, but an outrageous violation of one of the most essential rights of human nature, and utterly repugnant to the precepts of the gospel." &c.

In New Jersey also a Society was formed about this time. Says Judge Iredell in the North Carolina Convention, "when the entire abolition of slavery takes place, it will be an event which must be pleasing to every generous mind and every friend of human nature." (Deb. in N. C. Con.) Mr. Galloway, in the same convention said, "I apprehend the clause (touching the slave trade) means to bring forward manumission."

Luther Martin, a member of the Convention that formed the United States Constitution, says—"we ought to authorize the General Government to make such regulations as shall be the most advantageous for the gradual abolition of slavery and the emancipation of slaves who are already in the States."

Judge Wilson, one of the framers of the Constitution, said in the Pennsylvania Convention, "I consider this (the clause relative to the slave trade) as laying the foundation for banishing slavery out of this country. It will produce the same kind of gradual change which was produced in Pennsylvania, the new States which are to be formed, will be under the con-

trol of Congress in this particular, and slaves will never be introduced among them. * * * Yet the lapse of a few years, and Congress will have the power to exterminate slavery within our borders."

Governor Randolph, in the Virginia Convention, said: "They insist that the abolition of slavery will result from this Constitution: I hope there is no one here who will advance an objection so dishonorable to Virginia."

Mr. Johnson, in same place, said: "The principle of emancipation has begun since the revolution. Let us do what we will, it will come round."

In the Massachusetts Convention, in '88, Judge Dawes said: "Although slavery is not smitten by an apoplexy, yet it has received a mortal wound and will die of the consumption."

General Heath, in the same place, said: "Slavery was confined to the States now existing—it could not be extended."

Much more of the same character may be found in the pamphlet already mentioned.

The facts pertaining to the history of the times when the ordinance and the Constitution of the United States were both brought into being, and the language of them both, have satisfied my mind that no slave is reclaimable in Ohio unless he have escaped from one of the (13) original States, and that, with this exception, every human being, uncharged with crime, who is fortunate enough in any way to touch our soil, is free. J.

AMERICAN TOBACCO TRADE.

We published some time ago some interesting facts concerning the Tobacco Product of the United States. Since then, we have received in Mr. Hazard's valuable "Commercial and Statistical Register," a couple of tabular statements, the first of the amount of tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, exported from this country annually for the period of twenty years, from 1821 to 1839 inclusive, the others showing to what countries the larger portion of it has been sent.

It appears, from these tables, that during the period mentioned there were exported from the United States 1,792,000 hogsheds, valued by Treasury Department, \$131,346,514, being an annual average of 89,600 hogsheds, or \$6,567,325. The average annual export in the first 10 years was \$2,424 hogsheds, or \$5,688,929; and during the second 10 years, 96,775 or \$7,444,722. The average price during the first period was \$69 11 per hogshed, and during the second period \$76 84. The entire export of the last ten years exceeded that of the first 10 by 143,510 hogsheds, or \$17,567,932 in value.

Of the whole amount exported during the period of 20 years, there was sent
To England, 524,640 hds. \$50,194,466
France, 146,834 " 16,361,346
Holland, 423,407 " 21,907,465
Germany, 373,918 " 18,734,186
all other countries, 322,901 " 24,149,051
Total 1,792,000 \$131,346,514

In the first 10 years the shipment to England amounted to 241,919 hogsheds; in the second to 282,621; increase in the latter period, 40,802 hogsheds. The average annual export to England, during the 20 years, was 37,232 hogsheds, valued at \$2,599,723.

The increase of export to France, during the last ten years, over the first 10, was 15,190 hogsheds; and the average annual export to that country, for the 20 years, was 7,341 hogsheds, or \$517,067 value.

The export to Holland during the first 10 years, was more by 13,651 hogsheds, than during the last 10. The average annual export for the whole period, was 21,185 hogsheds, or \$1,095,373 in value.

The export to Germany during the last 10 years, was an increase of that upon the first 10, of 94,888 hogsheds. The annual export, during the 20 years, was 18,695 hogsheds, or \$936,709

This shows, at a glance, the extent and value of Tobacco Interest of this country, which has within a couple of years past caused no little talking, writing, and figuring. The States most concerned in it are Tennessee, Kentucky, Maryland and Virginia.—Cin. Gaz.

POLITICAL A. S. MEETING.

The political A. S. Convention, to consist of Delegates from the Legislative District, composed of the counties of Fayette, Highland, and Adams, notified to meet in Hillsborough, on the 22d inst, convened in the Presbyterian church at 10 o'clock on said day, when Wm. EDWARDS Esq. of Fayette county, was called to the Chair, and Wm. L. KEYS appointed Secretary. The meeting was opened with prayer, by Rev. SAMUEL STEELE. On motion of D. C. EASTMAN, members of A. S. Societies, from counties not in this district, who were present, were invited to take part in the deliberations of the Convention.

The following resolutions were read: Whereas, the general welfare will at all times demand the special attention of Legislators to some particular subjects; therefore,

I. Resolved, That whilst slavery continues to exert the controlling influence in our National Legislature; in our foreign intercourse, and financial relations, which it has hitherto exerted, we are bound by our obligations to the fundamental principles of our government; to our brethren who are the victims of oppression, and to the God of the universe, to exercise the political powers with which we are invested, for the overthrow of that system, and of all its auxiliaries, over which, we have an influence.

II. Resolved, That it is the duty of electors before exercising the elective franchise, for members of the Legislature, carefully to inquire to what subjects such special attention ought to be directed at the approaching session.

III. Resolved, That it is not only the right but the duty of all electors, on becoming satisfied that any one subject has claims to Legislative attention, paramount to all others, in giving their votes, to cast them for such candidates only as have views of the relative importance of such subject, corresponding with their own.

IV. That the only effectual method of ensuring to any subject in the Legislature, the prominence it demands, is, to give it that prominence at the polls.

V. That there are no subjects to which we have any reason for believing the attention of our next General Assembly will be directed, which equal in magnitude, or to which the honor and general welfare of the State, or the common interest of humanity so loudly demand attention, as the claims of our colored population.

VI. That the exclusion of our colored brethren from equal privileges with ourselves in courts of justice; the withholding from them the sacred right of trial by jury, and excluding their children from our public schools, are oppressive, unjust, and unconstitutional: we, therefore, feel bound, in the exercise of the right of suf-

frage, to do it with a special aim at a reform of these abuses.

VII. That reason and experience alike teach that it is vain to hope for men in office to place themselves in the front ranks of reform, when that reform was not made a chief ground of their selection as candidates for office.

VIII. In accordance with the foregoing resolutions.

Resolved, That Dyer Burgess of Adams, Wm. Keys of Highland, and J. S. Gillespie of Fayette, be appointed a committee to meet on the 12th of August, to nominate candidates for Senator and Representative for this Legislative District, and make said nomination public as soon as practicable, and that said committee have power to fill any vacancies in their own body.

Mr. THOMAS MORRIS was now called for, who responded by a thrilling appeal of more than two hours in length, with the first resolution as the basis of his remarks.

On motion of Mr. Boyle, Rev. Dyer Burgess was called for, who followed by some able and pointed remarks on the same subject.

This resolution was then adopted, in common with the remainder of the series, which were severally read and passed without a dissenting voice, eliciting appropriate remarks from various gentlemen. Mr. Morris, in support of the 6th resolution, gave a pleasing detail of the colored fair in the Baker st. Baptist church, Cincinnati.

Mr. Eastman, speaking to the 7th, commented with deserved severity on the dereliction of Mr. Russell, in declining to present to Congress a remonstrance against the 21st rule of the House.

On motion, the Secretary was instructed to prepare a minute of the proceedings of the Convention for publication, Convention then adjourned.

WM. EDWARDS, Pres.

WM. L. KEYS, Sec.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI,

Wednesday Morning, August 11, 1841.

We were anxious to introduce to our readers much selected matter this week, and have crowded ourselves out. A large amount of editorial on hand is laid over for next week. Correspondents also must wait.

The discussion on the Ordinance of '87 as will be seen, is still continued. We have not yet done with it.

The nominating conventions of the whig and democratic parties are soon to meet. Perhaps they had better consult the feelings of anti-slavery men in their respective selections. Thomas Morris' name was proposed in a part of the impression of the Enquirer last week, as that of one of the democratic candidates, but the editor announced it was by mistake. Perhaps so—but a democrat, not an abolitionist, had it inserted.

Salmon P. Chase was the second choice of the whig convention last year for the Senate of the State. The first choice, Judge Wright, will not, we suppose be a candidate this year. If Mr. Chase should be selected, we presume it would be quite a popular movement in this city. However, these politicians know their own concerns best.

We hope no reader will neglect the correspondence on our first page between Thomas Earle, and the Ex-Vice President of the United States. The letter of Mr. Earle is very finely and ably written.

The appeal of Thomas Morris to the Democratic party, we hope, will be carefully considered by at least the reflecting portion of that party.

INSURRECTION.

The New Orleans Crescent City gives the following account of an insurrection that was to be. Whether it be true or false, we know not.—The Crescent City is so vile a paper, it is well to receive its reports with great qualification.—This same paper, advises the murder of the free negroes in New Orleans! More of this next week.

Attempted Insurrection!! Negroes about to rise—Almost every Negro in Louisiana and Mississippi concerned in the Plot!!—Provisional frustration of Abolition plans, &c.

By the steamboat Clipper, Capt. Laurent, which arrived here yesterday from Bayou Sara, we have received information of an attempted insurrection among the negroes along the whole length of the coast. By a direct intimation of Providence, it would seem, this terrible catastrophe has been averted off, and the lives perhaps of thousands of our citizens protected.

A few days ago, the overseer upon the plantation of Mr. Bonita Barry, near Bayou Sara, in East Feliciana, after the slaves had retired to rest, had occasion to walk around the quarters to see if all was right. Hearing a low murmuring in one of the cabins, he crept round at the back and listened to the conversation. What was his astonishment when he heard the negroes discussing an attempted insurrection! He stayed long enough to learn what was contemplated—when the terrible havoc was to commence, and then immediately informed the owner of the slaves of their intended project, and in a few moments, the white persons about the establishment armed themselves, and arrested every suspected scoundrel on the plantation. By dint of threats and punishment, the negroes confessed the whole plan; and gave sufficient information to implicate a number of others in the neighborhood, among them a white man, a mechanic employed upon the plantation, who was to take a conspicuous part in the awful butchery of his own class and color!

On the first of August, the negroes throughout the whole of Louisiana and Mississippi were to rise and declare themselves free. Millions of property and thousands of lives were to be destroyed; masters were to become slaves, and slaves masters! It was to commence at a season, too, when we least expected it, for in the month of August, none but residents of the South remain at home, and aided by the loss of numbers, and the latitude of the climate, in the white man the spirit of activity would be lost, and the field entirely open and unobscured to the negro, for a scene which in blood might rival the ghastly days of France, or the purple tide which flowed in the birth of our own Republic!

Expresses were instantly sent around to the different plantations, and the white inhabitants, to the number of two hundred, formed themselves into a body and scoured the country. Nearly one hundred negroes have been taken and imprisoned. Their trials were to have taken place yesterday at 10 o'clock. Although many of those arrested were occupied on plantations miles and miles apart from each other, still each slave, upon being separately questioned, corroborated and confessed precisely the same in detail, as the first ones made prisoners!

Arrests have also been made in the vicinity of Woodville. So much unanimity prevailed among the slaves, that 400 of them on one plantation in Feliciana, were said to be in the conspiracy.

It appears to have been a regularly organized conspiracy, from Bayou Sara to Natchez, on both sides of the river, (about 150 miles.)

When the steamboat left, they were still continuing to

arrest and imprison. It behooves us to be on our guard now.

P. S. The report, as we suppose, was exaggerated. The insurrectionary plot, as we learn from better sources, was confined to a few plantations.—ED. PHIL.

CONGRESS.

July 29th. In Senate, the Home squadron bill was reported without amendment.

The bill to renew the charters of the Banks in the District was then taken up, and discussed till the Senate went into Executive business.

In the House, Mr. Levy, on leave, introduced a bill making further provision for the termination of the Florida Negro hunt. Read twice, and referred to the committee on military affairs. The revenue bill was then taken up in committee of the whole, the question being on the motion to strike out the enacting clause. The committee at length rose, and it was then moved to reconsider the vote by which the House had agreed to take the revenue bill out of the committee at 12 o'clock, on the 30th.

30th. In the Senate, the District Bank Bill being under consideration, Mr. Wright spoke in opposition to the amendment, which allowed the banks to receive and pay out the notes of suspended banks till the 4th of March next. The amendment was agreed to—yeas 21, nays 18. The bill after several amendments, was ordered to be engrossed—yeas 30, nays 14. The bill making provision for the lunatics of the District was then ordered to be engrossed—yeas 24, nays 17. The Home squadron bill was passed.

In the House, the motion to reconsider was withdrawn, and the House resolved itself into committee of the whole on the revenue bill. At 12 o'clock the bill was reported, and Mr. Ather-ton's motion to strike out the enacting clause, was lost—yeas 81, nays 119. After some slight amendment, the bill was ordered to be engrossed.

July 31st. The Senate did not sit. In the House, several bills of no great moment were acted upon. The following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be hereby directed to inquire into the expediency of aiding individuals or companies in the establishment of lines of armed steamers between some of our principal Northern and Southern ports, and to foreign ports; to advertise for proposals for the establishment of such lines as he may deem most important and practicable; and to report to this House at the next session of Congress."

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby directed to inquire and report to the next session of Congress as to the expediency of purchasing a steamer, and establishing a ship yard for building ships and steam vessels, on the Ohio or Mississippi rivers, to serve as a depot for naval stores, and to give the means for repairs."

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be also instructed to inquire and report as to the expediency of establishing depots for coal to be used in the naval service at Mobile, Pensacola, Key West, and such other points as may be deemed suitable."

The Bankrupt bill from the Senate came up, and was referred to the committee of the whole, and the revenue bill was passed—yeas 116, nays 101. The motion to reconsider this vote, failed.

For the Philanthropist.

TO THE DEMOCRATIC PORTION OF THE PEOPLE OF OHIO.

I address you, not altogether of my own choice, but in compliance with the opinion and advice of many friends in different parts of the State, who are zealous of your cause, and belong to your ranks. I comply then with great diffidence, but I trust and hope that you will hear me with the same candor that I address you. My object is the success of your cause and the triumph of your principles, now, and in time to come; and I wish to convince you that NEGRO SLAVERY as it exists in the United States, is at war with those principles, and if it be made a part of your political creed, or in the least degree mould your political action in its favor, it will forever prevent your success. "Pure and undefiled" democracy cannot bear the least admixture of slavery; its poisonous nature will corrupt the whole mass, its leaden weight if you attempt to carry it, will enfeeble all your energies and render you an easy prey to your political opponents. I admonish you then as an old, and I trust, not an untutored friend. Nature has pushed me into the midst of a new generation; permit me then to remind you of some things that are past, and to speak of those which are present; and in doing so, if I am compelled to speak of scenes in which I have borne an humble part, it will only be from the fact that my views and my motives cannot otherwise be fully understood.

In May, 1796, I became a settler in the county, though then but a youth, and I have resided from that day to this within thirty miles of this city, now my home. I took an active part, (though then but scarcely of age) in the first election of members to the Territorial Legislature, and also afterwards in the election of members to the Convention. I acted with the democratic side. I voted then for such men as the late Judge Goforth of Columbia, the late Judge Dunlevy, Jeremiah Morrow, John Smith, and John N. O'Brien the first editor and owner of the Gazette in this city. We had then with us the late Judge Symmes; and General Harrison, then a young man, took the same side and was elected by the democratic members of the legislature our first delegate in Congress. I well remember that as far as my conversation and knowledge amongst the people extended, we were urged forward by the consideration that our candidates were OPPOSED TO SLAVERY IN ANY FORM.

We succeeded, and I claim for the people of that day democracy undefiled; and I ask the people now to look at their works for proof of what I say. I assert without a doubt, that had any gentleman whose name I have mentioned, or any other who should then have expressed the slightest opinion that the right of petition should be denied in favor of, or to the colored man, or that slavery could exist here in any form whatever, or for a single moment, the name of such a person would have become a reproach, and he could not have been elected to any office whatever. You will see, that under the Ordinance of 1787, negroes were not denied the right of suffrage, nor were they ineligible as representatives, if they had been citizens of one of the United States three years, and then a resident of this district, or had resided in the district three years. Nor did the laws of the Territory make any alteration in this provision. Negroes therefore had the right to vote, and if my memory be correct in one or two cases, did vote for members of the Convention. I then resided in Clermont county; we had but two or three colored men at that time in the county, and they voted—no understood the facts. Your democratic Constitution was therefore the effect in part of sycophancy; the vote of things, which are hunted in this day by dogs (Cuba bloodhounds) as beasts of prey.

No wonder then that the head of democracy is now sick and her heart faint. In the early days of our State we fully believed, with the framers of the Constitution of the United States, that under the benign influence of the democratic principles of that instrument, slavery would soon cease in all the United States; and one of the main reasons assigned for the passage of the first act by our legislature, to regulate black and mulatto persons, was, that the negroes would be set free in the slaveholding states, and would be pressed by their former owners to migrate into this state—that at least this would be the case with the infirm and refractory slave, if it extended no further, and that those who had drawn labor from the slave without reward should keep him, if such, in their own country; hence the disabling statute of January 5th, 1804, was passed. In the year 1806 I was for the first time elected a member of the state legislature; I was present when the next act concerning negroes and mulattoes was passed in January, 1807. I well recollect the same kind of reasoning on the passage of that act, as I understood, had before been used on the passage of the first act. Though then but barely of age to be a member, I opposed with what ability I had the passage of that act, both on the ground of its injustice, and its inefficiency to answer the purpose intended; contending that all laws to restrain men were ineffectual without a penalty, that the negro would come here if he thought proper, and can you make that a crime! Surely not. The famous clause was then introduced to authorize the overseers of the poor to remove any black or mulatto person who had not complied with the law, in the same manner as is required in case of paupers. A wonderful discovery, that a man shall be deemed poor because he is black or half black! Democracy had nothing to do with the passage of these laws: its aim is, equal and exact justice to men of all climes and colors. And I well know that a hint in that day, on the subject of negro slavery, of the kind which is openly avowed by many as part of the democratic creed of the present day, would have sealed the political fate of any one. Suppose Thomas Jefferson in his first inaugural address, had said precisely what Mr. Van Buren did in his inaugural address, on the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia, would he have been elected! No, he would have met the fate Mr. Van Buren has, and with greater indignation against him. But what would have been the condition of Mr. Jefferson, if he had had the opportunity, and done what Mr. Van Buren did in the case of the Amistad negroes? Not all his former fair fame and public service, could have saved him from ignominy and disgrace. I was amongst the earliest and firmest friends of Mr. Van Buren in our state—a friend to his promotion to the Presidency, and my faith in his purity and justice remained unshaken until the delivery of his inaugural address. I then condemned his remarks on the slave question instantly, as gratuitous and uncalled for, though I thought it more an act of inadvertence than design; but the proceedings of the Government in the case of the Amistad negroes convinced me that his object was more to gain favor with the slaveholding power, than the establishment of justice. And I say to the democracy of the state, as my deliberate opinion, that Mr. Van Buren can never again be elected President by the democracy of the Union: democratic principles are too pure for such contamination. At the last election the free states deserted him almost in mass. Of the seven states which voted for him, five were slave states; New Hampshire and Illinois it may well be said are nominally free states, but with the feelings of slave states, and in a great measure the interests too. If then Mr. Van Buren, the strong man of the democracy, as we all once thought him, has sunk under the burden of slavery, how can we expect to stand under a like burden? The late law on the subject of fugitives from labor, commonly called the black act, is another instance of the fall of public men in our state who attempt to link themselves with the slaveholding power. Very few of the men who voted for that law, if I have correct information, have retained the public favor, and those few who have been fortunate enough to do so, will find favor constantly diminishing. It is, I believe an undisputed fact, that every effort of the democratic party in our state, to favor the slave system in any manner whatever, either by denunciations against anti-slavery movements or men, or by their resolves in meetings, or in their public press have done more harm to us, than to advance the democratic cause. I admit that some few of the leaders have found it to their advantage, while the cause of democracy itself, has been a great sufferer. And the opposition which the freedom of the black man has met with in our state, has produced a contrary effect to that intended, by curbing the power and unlawful acts of the slaveholder. Will you then exclude from your confidence and your trust every man who will not join the outcry in favor of slavery under the plea of southern rights and southern trade, and who will not lend himself as a Cuba bloodhound to the slave-hunter to track his fugitive from labor across the free soil of Ohio?

I deny in the most solemn manner that an abolitionist or any other person in Ohio, as far as my knowledge extends, will use force to prevent the slaveholder from taking his slave from our state, if he will proceed according to our laws; but we will vote for no men who will justify the violation of our free-soil and our bed-chambers by the slaveholder in search of his runaway slave; nor ought we to give our votes or countenance to any person who will voluntarily or for a proffered reward pursue and capture a fugitive from labor, in order to deliver him to his master. It is disgrace enough to us that we have laws on this subject making our officers the catchpoles of the slave-holder, for regular fees. Let those laws be fully and faithfully executed; but I have not language sufficient to express my abhorrence of the man who would voluntarily and for money aid in consigning a fellow-man who has committed no crime, into the hands of a slaveholder. He is a land pirate, and deserves the fate of a pirate on the ocean.

My first principle of democracy is, "ESTABLISH JUSTICE." This is declared to be the chief end and object of our Constitution; and if we do not this, in equal and exact measure to all men, our government is a mockery. He that will not do justice to a black man, will do injustice to a white man if he can make gain by the act; and he that will not do justice where it is most required, and will not endeavor to establish it where it is most trodden down, will never do justice in lesser matters. Slavery is the most heinous offence against justice, that man can possibly commit; it is the essence of all other crimes. The slave power in our country degrades labor and puts men upon devices to live by some other means. When men can claim it to be lawful to monopolize human flesh, and buy and sell men, women and children, it is no wonder then that monopolies of less grade and less dangerous to the country, such as banks, should grow up, grow rich and bid defiance to law and moral justice from the same principle. That the banking system is contrary to republican government, and at war with democratic principles, there can be no doubt, (at least in my mind,) but what are banks in our country when compared to slavery? Harmless institutions, dependent on the slave-power, which can make and unmake them at pleasure, it has swallowed up all their means, and has produced the present derangement in that which we call the currency. And as long as the slave-power rules the country as it now does, we may not only look for a deranged currency, but derangement in the finances of the country, the administration of justice and all the social relations of life. Florida wars and home squabbles will be our lot. It is vain and idle to calculate keeping three millions of people in absolute subjection, unless by a constant strong and well organized military force. I do not pretend to say, that because slavery is the greatest evil in the country, it follows that we ought not to correct as far as possible all evils of a lesser magnitude. The next to slavery in grade and influence I consider the banking system. It

will now I trust be a conceded point, that Congress have not the constitutional power to incorporate and locate a bank in any of the States. The friends of this doctrine have given it up, and retreated with disgrace into the District of Columbia, and by the bill which has passed the Senate have said, (as I understand,) that no branch shall be established within any state without the consent of such state; but if any state dares not declare its dissent to such measure at the first session of its legislature after the passage of the bill by Congress, it shall be taken and holden as having assented thereto, and also that a future Congress may at any time when they deem it necessary and proper, establish a branch in any state as a fiscal agent. I deem this legislation of Congress not only violatory of the Constitution of the United States, but derogatory to and incompatible with the sovereignty of the states.

If Congress have not the power to establish a bank in any of the States, it follows as a necessary consequence it has no such power to establish a branch within any State, the consent of a State cannot give such power: for this would make the constitutional power of Congress dependent on a State, and what it might be constitutional for Congress to do in one State, would be unconstitutional in another. But the glaring and violent principle in the bill as it passed the Senate, is that Congress has undertaken to bind the States, or to legislate for them in their sovereign character, by declaring that if the States do not dissent they shall be considered as having assented. From what source has Congress derived the power to declare that the States have passed a law or resolution because they have done nothing on the subject? This is despotism double distilled, not despotism over a man, but despotism over a sovereign State, and if there is left one spark of independence in any of the States, this despotism will be resisted. While as citizens of a State, we cannot forget that we are citizens also of the United States, and we are bound at all times to sustain the constitutional action of Congress with our treasure or our blood if necessary, yet it is our duty to preserve the sovereignty of the States with equal care.

For if Congress can say by implication that the States have legislated when they have not, Congress can legislate for them in all cases whatever. I state the case so as to bring it to the understanding of every man. And yet this absurdity in legislation has been procured from Congress, or at least the Senate, by the influence of the bank and money power of the country; of this there can be no doubt. If the democratic portion of our fellow-citizens cannot now see that it is vain and useless to tamper with the money power, bestowing upon it privileges and immunities by the incorporation of banks or otherwise; and that it is worse than useless to attempt to reform banks, and keep their action within those bounds which ought to mark and circumscribe the action of an honest man, I confess I have little hope of the reformation of any abuse whatever. Crime will continue to stalk through our land as it now does; except the miserable individual who commits it has neither the slave power, the banking power, or the power of political party spirit to sustain him.

Believing as I do that the slave system existing in our country is more dangerous to its peace and prosperity than any other whatever, I cannot consent to give my vote to any man who will support its power and influence ever for the purpose of correcting any lesser evil, and I have no doubt but there are thousands if not tens of thousands in Ohio who think as I have stated on this subject. It is wise for you then my fellow-citizens to exclude from your confidence, and force from your ranks all who are with you on every question but that of slavery? In fact, do you yourselves hold to the doctrine of slavery? Surely not. Why then not oppose it by every legal and constitutional means? Why not give to the colored man the right to labor and defend his life and liberty, pursue and obtain happiness and safety, and acquire and protect property? These rights are declared by the Constitution to belong equally to all men, yet you abridge or take from colored men their rights, when you deny to them their testimony in a court of justice, &c. We ask you then to consent to a repeal of the unjust law of January, 1840, on the subject of blacks and mulattoes, and give the trial by jury to the claimed fugitive from labor. Consent to select candidates for the legislature who will do all this, and as far as I know and fully believe, you will bring back joyfully into your ranks thousands of your fellow-citizens who will not otherwise go with you. There may be some who would require more, but I hope not. We shall then feel safe from the arrogance of the slave-power in our state, if our courts will faithfully and impartially administer the law, as it then will be. This we have every confidence they will do.

THOMAS MORRIS.

Cincinnati, August 5, 1841.

For the Philanthropist.

ANOTHER SLAVE BURNING.

Mr. Editor:—Being in Kentucky a few days ago, I had from a very intelligent gentleman residing in Ohio county, in that State, the following account of an outrage on humanity, which has not yet, I think, found its way into the public journals.

Phiegley, living in Ohio county, had on hire last year, a slave-boy ten or twelve years old.—The boy took the opportunity afforded him by Phiegley's absence to gratify his appetite with some dried fruit which he was enabled to lay his hands on. For this offence P. together with a man named Cardwell, who it seems was living with P. beat the boy unmercifully with sticks, switches &c. Not satisfied however, with having done this, they again seized him, threw him down naked and held him near a large fire till his head, body and limbs were baked to a blister. They completed their diabolical work by salting his back. The boy died not long afterward. The owner of the boy, name Carson, claimed of Phiegley and Cardwell his value.—Arbitrators were chosen, who awarded to Carson \$260.

This horrible affair took place in October last, and the murderers remained unmolested by any criminal process, till the last April term of the Ohio Circuit Court, when an indictment was found against them. They got out of the way, and still remain out of the way; but will probably return when the matter is a little older.—No proclamation by the Governor offering a reward for their apprehension has been issued.

B.

From the N. Y. Evening Star.

ENGLISH PROTECTIVE SYSTEM.

We notice that, in the English papers, there is considerable feeling among the anti-slavery ranks on the subject of high duties upon the products of free labor. We cannot say but that we rejoice in this, for it will necessarily force upon Great Britain the true view of the slavery question as it respects the United States, and it must greatly alter their tone of denunciation against us. The facts of the case may be thus briefly stated:—By the prohibitory duties upon American corn, which is mainly the product of free labor, and by the reception of cotton and other articles, wholly the products of slave labor, at very moderate duties, England is virtually and practically offering a premium on slave labor. By her present arrangements, the merchant must send cotton, the product of slave labor, because it brings a better price in England than corn, or he must send the precious metals to pay for the goods he has ordered. So long, therefore, as England will pay the price, the merchant will remit; and so long as the mer-

chant will buy, so long the planter will grow cotton by the toil of the slave.

But let England repeal her corn laws, and soon the following results will take place:

1. Bread will be furnished cheaper and better to the poor than it can be whilst the corn laws exist.

2. The vast regions of the North and West will raise corn for England, and will keep it at a low price. Thus a new stimulant will be afforded for free labor.

3. The merchant will then remit corn, and will pay for his goods with the proceeds of free labor.

4. Cotton will necessarily fall in price. Slave labor will become unprofitable; for at the present time, the price of a slave, in Alabama or Mississippi, is regulated by the price of cotton in Liverpool.

The only way to convince worldly men, on the subject of slavery, is through the pocket. So England thought when, though loaded with an enormous debt, she voted and paid twenty millions sterling as a remuneration for the freedom of her 600,000 slaves. So long as slavery is profitable, there are not wanting men who will tenaciously hold on to it. But when it shall become unprofitable, the South, without any aid from the North, will soon pass the necessary laws to effect the freedom of every slave.

We say to the English, why not permit the U. States to pay for your manufactures in the freeman's labor, rather than in the sweat and blood of the slave? So long as you shut the door upon our corn, and keep the door open for cotton, so long slavery will continue in the United States, and the continuance of it must be laid to your door. Practically, it is a question rather of profit and loss, than of conscience, with the great mass. Now, if England is sincere and honest in desiring the freedom of the slaves in the United States, she must show her sincerity by her work—by placing free labor upon at least an equal footing with slave labor. Do not, then, blame our planters for holding slaves, when your government holds out a high premium for the products of their labor. Do not condemn our northern merchants for buying the cotton from the South, when the English manufacturer prefers to corn.

It is in the power of England, by one single act, to destroy the whole system of slavery in the United States. Let the corn laws be repealed. As England was originally concerned in fixing slavery upon us while we were her colonies, let her now, with noble disinterestedness, so act as to wipe that dark blot from our land. Until England places herself in an attitude not to pay a premium for slavery, it is in vain for her papers and her abolition lecturers to declaim against the wickedness and inconsistency of our country in holding slaves.

I have not yet received a Friend of Man, containing the third letter addressed to me by William Goodell. Will he be kind enough to send it. In a short time, I design republishing his letters.

Rev. Edward Smith, the Methodist preacher who attended our anniversary, has been suspended on account of his abolitionism. We hope to be able to secure his services as agent.

RECEIPTS.

FOR PHILANTHROPIST.

From 21st of June, to 7th August.

J. M. Edwards, 1.00; H. P. Dearborn, 2.00; Stephen Taylor, 1.00; Ralph Porter, 2.00; Abner Johnson, 2.00; Rev. Mr. Hollich, 2.00; Jas. Murphy, 2.00; Jas. Moore, 2.00; G. W. Benton, 1.00; Hon. J. Collet, 4.00; Farr & King, 2.00; Wm. Kinney, 3.00; Joel Perkins, 2.50; A. Brooke, 2.00; Jonathan Collett, 7.00; N. L. Chalkley, 3.00; Wm. Bentley, 2.00; W. S. Barrett, 2.00; Miles, 2.00; Watson, 2.00; J. A. Corne, 2.00; A. Mathers, 2.00; G. Pomeroy, 2.00; Dr. J. P. Gazzam, 2.50; Robert Cox, 2.00; Jno. Fisher, 1.00; Isaac Common, 2.00; Nathan Compton, 1.50; Halsey Hulbert, 2.00; C. Cunningham, 5.00; Wm. Sheldon, 2.00; Francis Kellogg, 1.00; C. K. Riley, 2.00; Lewis Cox, 2.00; Nathl Brown, Jr., 82; Wm. Macy, 2.00; Wm. Richardson, 2.00; W. T. Preston, 2.00; Wm. Stead, 2.00; Geo. Dr. Holston, 3.00; F. D. Parish Esq., 2.00; John Cady, 2.00; Moses Farewell, 2.00; Hatt Bailey, 2.00; Dr. Lemoyne, 2.00; E. T. Agnes, 2.00; Geo. Freed, 2.00; Robt. Marvin, 3.00; Wm. Macy, 1.00; Henry Thornburg, 1.00; Sam. G. Numan, 2.00; Moses Wylie, 3.00; A. Findley, 3.00; Wm. Poole, 2.00; S. Morrill, 2.00; James Davis, 2.00; A. Torrell, 2.00; Wm. H. Key, 2.00; Wm. S. Barrett, 2.00; Miles, 2.00; Darden, 2.00; Reuben Dillon, 2.00; Dan. Dubois, 2.00; Rev. J. W. McCormick, 2.00; Wm. Sturges, 3.00; Robt. Stewart, 1.00; Wm. B. Unthank, 2.00; J. N. Brown, 2.00; B. H. Hunter, 2.00; John Rose, 2.00; Wm. Brooks, 1.00; Ira Lovell, 5.00; Francis Child, 2.00; Mary Lewis, 3.00; W. T. Adams, 1.00; John Brown, 3.00; Peter B. Sargent, 2.00; Wm. Key, 2.00; E. T. Preston, 2.00; Thos. James, 2.00; Jas. Jenkins, 3.00; Rev. S. W. Arthurs, 2.00; Samuel M. Smith, 2.00; Aquilla Hurford, 4.00; Isaac Thomas, 1.00; Jas. M. Fletcher, 2.00; Rev. Parker & Smith, 1.00; Dr. E. Martin, 2.00; Jos. S. Gillespie, Harris & Packard, 3.00; Dr. John Mote, 2.00; H. R. Reynolds, 2.00; Dudley Walton, 2.00; Abel James, 1.00; Wm. H. Evans, 2.00; Wm. C. Brown, 2.00; Wm. Wood, 1.00; S. R. Baleson, 2.00; Wm. Stevenson, 2.00; McLaughlin & Graham, 2.00; Robert Kirkpatrick, 2.00; J. Dunlap, 2.00; O. Lusk, 2.00; Lewis Morgan, 4.00; Henry Cary, 2.00; Samuel Winsans, 3.00; John Hamilton, 1.00; B. S. Hunter, 2.00; Jacob Augustine, 2.00; Perry Dakin, 2.00; George Ramsey, 2.00; Dr. O. Miles, 2.00; Rev. Thomas Borton, 2.00; Washington Hope, 2.00; Henry G. Waters, 2.00; J. W. Miller, 1.00; Williamson & McNeal, 2.00; R. L. Rosebrough, 2.00; Chas. Williams, 1.00; Wm. McNesbie, 2.00; Jas. McClain, 2.00; S. G. Salisbury, 1.00; Sam. Pangburn, 1.00; John Snedker, 1.00; Archibald Hopkins, 2.00; J. Porter, 2.00; D. B. Evans, 5.00; John McLaughlin, 1.00; Robt. McClellan, 2.00; Wm. C. Cable, 2.00; A. Burrell, 2.00; Carpenter & Ballard, 1.00; O. Unity, 2.00; Rev. R. L. Elzior, 2.00; Gaylord, 2.00; A. N. Doty, 2.00; Dr. E. T. Mason, 2.00; Wm. E. Parmelee, 2.00; C. Tomlinson, 2.00; S. Stanley, 2.00; Abrahm Wilmont, 2.00; P. Morse Jr., 1.00; Wm. M. Ashton, 2.00; Samuel Patterson, 2.00; S. McDougal, 2.00; Thos. Ingals, 1.00; John McKinnin, 5.00; Rev. Lewis French, 1.00; R. M. Walker, 2.00; A. S. Merrill, 2.00; Marshall & Ladd, 2.00.

Wm. DEARLOVE, Pub. Agent.

The \$25.00 credited Col. R. M. Stewart, in Vol. 5 N. 52, should have been Col. Robt. Stewart.

Also the \$5.00 credited Dr. Hawley, as a donation should have been credited him on account with the Philanthropist.

W. D.

Cincinnati prices Current.

(Corrected Weekly for the Philanthropist.)

August 5, 1841.

WHEAT, 1.00; Rye, 1.00; Corn, 1.00; Oats, 1.00; Beans, 1.00; Peas, 1.00; Potatoes, 1.00; Apples, 1.00; Butter, 1.00; Lard, 1.00; Sugar, 1.00; Coffee, 1.00; Tea, 1.00; Spices, 1.00; Soap, 1.00; Candles, 1.00; Oil, 1.00; Wine, 1.00; Brandy, 1.00; Rum, 1.00; Gin, 1.00; Whisky, 1.00; Vinegar, 1.00; Mustard, 1.00; Pickles, 1.00; Preserves, 1.00; Jam, 1.00; Marmalade, 1.00; Syrup, 1.00; Honey, 1.00; Molasses, 1.00; Sugar-cane, 1.00; Coffee-cake, 1.00; Tea-cake, 1.00; Spice-cake, 1.00; Soap-cake, 1.00; Candle-cake, 1.00; Oil-cake, 1.00; Wine-cake, 1.00; Brandy-cake, 1.00; Rum-cake, 1.00; Gin-cake, 1.00; Whisky-cake, 1.00; Vinegar-cake, 1.00; Mustard-cake, 1.00; Pickle-cake, 1.00; Preserve-cake, 1.00; Jam-cake, 1.00; Marmalade-cake, 1.00; Syrup-cake, 1.00; Honey-cake, 1.00; Molasses-cake, 1.00; Sugar-cane-cake, 1.00; Coffee-cake, 1.00; Tea-cake, 1.00; Spice-cake, 1.00; Soap-cake, 1.00; Candle-cake, 1.00; Oil-cake, 1.00; Wine-cake, 1.00; Brandy-cake, 1.00; Rum-cake, 1.00; Gin-cake, 1.

AGRICULTURAL.

From the New Genesee Farmer
Pear Trees.

We find pear trees in less demand than almost any other article in the nursery. Why should this be so? The pear is one of our most delicious fruits: though from the scarcity of the trees in the country, it is not improbable that many cultivators have never tasted the better kinds.

As an excuse for neglecting the pear tree however, we have often heard it said, "they are so long before they begin to bear." Now this is the very reason why they should be planted without delay—why no time should be lost.

The remarks however, are only true in part. Some pear trees indeed, like the Bergamot, require much time to get ready; but others like the Juliette, appear to come into bearing as soon as the apple tree; and this trait of character is certainly of no less importance than the color or the size of the fruit, which promulgators are always so careful to mention. If the time required by each kind to come into bearing, was generally known, purchasers of young trees could be much better accommodated. Delicious sorts in all cases would be wanted, but we could well afford to wait several years for the Summer Rose, the Rousette de Rheims, or the Belle Bonne, to grow large and get ready, when Williams' Bond Chretien, the Summer Frankreal, or the Bloodgood, were bearing in the meantime. Of 81 sorts noticed by Manning in his "Book of Fruits," 17 are mentioned as "coming in early bearing," though several belonging to this class he has not marked; and at this time we have in the nursery, many trees of the Juliette, not more than six or seven feet high, in full flower. Grafts, of this variety, of the Cushing, of the Johonnet, &c. set upon old stocks, bore in two years.

The pear is one of the hardiest fruit trees; and so far as our observations have extended, it is neither subject to the attacks of the caterpillar, nor the borer. Some perish, however, with the fire blight; but it should not be allowed. The owner has as much right to complain of bad luck when he stands by while his cattle are destroying his young trees, as he has when he stands idle, without reaching forth a hand, while *Scythia pyri* destroys his old trees. Possibly however, there are two kinds of fire-blight; but be this as it may, many of the trees have stood more than twenty years, without any losses of consequence; though the fire blight has been several times amongst them—owing entirely as we believe, to this circumstance: we have cut off the dying limb and burnt it without delay.

The Farmer's Life.

BY H. COLMAN.

What a means of imparting pleasure is an improved agriculture. How many charming excursions present themselves among us of improvements which the eye gazes on with unmingled delight. Let a man according to his power, take his ten, his twenty, his fifty, his hundred acres. Let him comb the hair, and wash the face of nature. Let him subdue, clear, cultivate, enrich, embellish it. Let him smooth the rough places; and drain the wet, and fill up the sunken and enrich the barren. Let him enclose it with a neat and substantial fence. Let him line its borders and road sides with ornamental trees, and let him stock every part with vines and fruits. Let his fields and his meadows wave with their golden harvest, and let his hills be covered with the herds rejoicing in the fulness with which his labors, under the blessing of God have spread their table, and who, when he goes among them, hasten from all sides to meet him and greet him and greatly to recognize in him a friend and benefactor, and lick the hand which is accustomed to feed and fondle them. Here now let us see the neatly painted cottage with its green shades, its piazza relieved with vines, its sides covered with the spreading elm or flowering acacia, with here and there the beautiful fur to shade the picture, and the mountain ash showing its rich clusters of crimson fruit among the deep foliage, and the smooth and verdant lawn stretching its soft and beautiful carpet in the front view; then look again and see the parents at the close of the day, resting from their labors, and enjoying the calm evening, with their pledges of mutual and devoted affection rioting before them in all the buoyancy of youthful innocence and delight; and if, at such an hour as this you can hear the hymn of praise rising from this humble abode of peace and love, and its charming notes mingling with the music of the gurgling brook that flows near by, or broken by the occasional shrill and hollow notes of the gentle and fearless birds, which deem themselves loving members of this loving household; if then, whether traveller or sojourner, your heart is not touched with this charming and not unusual picture of rural felicity, cease to call yourself a man. If still you sigh for the bustle and noise and the confinement of the city, with its impure water, and its offensive odors, with its despicable affectations, with its heartless formalities, with its violent excitements, with its midnight festivities, with its utter destitution of sympathy, with its low estimate of human life, with its squalid poverty, its multiplied forms of wretchedness and crime, its pride, its vanity, its ambition, its pomp, its servility; then go back to your gilded prison house, and to pleasure which an uncorrupted and refined taste, accustomed to drink in the free air of heaven, and to appreciate its freshness, its purity, and its salubrity, will find no occasion to covet or envy. The man who by his cultivation and good husbandry presents such a picture to the passer by, shall not be called a benefactor to the community? Has he not done much to improve and bless society by his example? Has he not built a monument to his own honor more eloquent than the marble.

From the Cultivator.
American Butter Abroad.

In the London Commercial Journal of March 27, there are some remarks on the subject of American butter makers. There is every probability that butter and cheese to a considerable amount will be annually exported from this country, and it seems very desirable that it should be of good quality. This can never be the case, particularly with butter, unless more attention is paid to its manufacture. There is no disguising the fact, that immense quantities of butter find their way to the market, in a condition which renders it unfit for anything but grease. Hot weather, or the shortest voyage, renders it intolerably rancid. New butter made in Holland may be carried to any distance, and in any climate, without suffering material deterioration, hence it is in demand for exportation. Vast quantities annually find their way to Great Britain for domestic consumption and otherwise, and the high prices demonstrate the estimation in which it is held. There are no finer pastures in the world, than in the United States, particularly those north of the Ohio, and if proper

attention and skill was given to the products of the dairy, those products might be unrivalled. There is a considerable amount of excellent butter made in the country, but it is used for domestic consumption, and the proportion of the first rate article bears but a slight comparison with the whole. There is less difference in the cheese of this country and European ones, than there is in the butter; and consequently less difference in the prices. But in both butter and cheese, so far as the great mass of these products are concerned, there is room for decided improvement, and we doubt not our dairy women would consult their own interest, as well as the credit of the country, in giving more care to the production of superior articles; but to the extract.

"At a public sale of American butter, at Liverpool, it fetched the best sort, 84s., seconds 72 to 74s., duty paid; while inferior, sold only at 43s. 4d., in bond of which the parcel chiefly consisted. The quantity at the London market, shows the same results, the principal part sold for greasy purposes. The American makers of butter are very far behind the Irish, English or Dutch; from the first operation to the last, all seems to be done without system or care. The same materials would be managed by experienced hands, fetch in this market 25 or 30s., more money. There is evidently no proper attention paid to the making, salting, putting down or packing."

A correspondent of one of our commercial papers says—"The best American butter imported into England this year, has sold not higher than 95 shillings, while the best from the continent has fetched 110 to 115 shillings; this latter will keep for years."

Ripening of Pears.

After selecting the article on this subject from the *Gardner's Chronicle*, which appeared in our last number, we brought two kinds of pears from the cellar, where they had remained all winter as hard as when they were taken from the tree, and placed them in a warm room. In about ten days, one sort which had been as green as grass, changed to a golden yellow, and became melting and delicious. An accident has prevented us from giving the name.—The other sort also softened soon after, and was considered fine; but it is clearly a misnomer.

In winters past we have had several kinds of pears in the cellar, that either rotted or were thrown to the pigs in the spring, which we are now satisfied would have ripened in a warm room.

From the Cultivator.
Things not to be Done.

Attempting to keep cattle, sheep and horses, through our long winters on straw or even hay, without roots, is a thing not to be done. Every good farmer will, therefore, make his arrangements so as to secure a plentiful supply of turnips, potatoes, or carrots, for winter and spring use. These fed with hay, will improve the stock, promote health, and bring the animals through the most trying season of the year with safety and profit.

Making a yard of the highway, and allowing your cattle and sheep to be fed, and to drop their dung where it is lost to farm, is not to be done. This practice, though a common one, is a wretched one, and should be reformed altogether. Feed your animals in stalls, if you can; if not, in yards. To do otherwise, is wasteful in the extreme.

Allowing your cattle in the spring of the year to go roaming about, poaching your meadows and pastures with their feet, is not to be done. The small amount of food they can get in this way is a poor compensation for the damage they do, and besides it destroys their relish for hay, without offering any substitute.

Suffering animals to perish for the want of attention, at any season of the year, is a thing not to be done. But if any do die accidentally, they should be converted to use by being covered with earth, to absorb the gases of oxygen and ammonia that are the inevitable results of animal putrefaction, and which are indispensable to the growth of plants.

Have your pig sty in such a state, or place, that pigs shall not work for a living, is a thing not to be done. They should have a yard into which wheels, swamp muck, straw, and the scrapings of roads and ditches should be thrown at any time reluctant to begin the task of mixing such materials, a few handfuls of corn scattered over the surface will set them to work most industriously.

Permitting the chips, pieces of bark, sawdust, &c., of your wood yard to accumulate for years, is a thing not to be done. Remember that all which has once formed a part of a plant can be converted into a plant again, and place all such matters where their decomposition will be most useful, and soonest effected.

Nearly ever farm has some pond, marsh, or bog which receives a large portion of the wash of the cultivated land; and to allow this to remain without being returned to the soil, is a thing not to be done. There are some such places that may be considered as inexhaustible deposits of fertilizing matter, yet have never been drawn up for a single load, by the neighboring farmers. Let those who have such deposits look to them.

Allowing your work to drive you a thing not to be done. The man who is a half an hour behind his work, finds labor forever an uphill business. There is a serious mistake committed by many farmers. They lay out more work than they can do well, or in season, and the consequence is, nothing is done at the time, or as it should be. What you do, in season, and be sure to do well.

Being content to allow a single year to pass without correcting some error, or making some improvement in husbandry, is a thing not to be done. In conversation with an intelligent farmer the other day, he remarked that the practice of all fell behind as well as they knew how.—To put the knowledge we acquire from our own experience to others' use, should be the aim of every one; and would soon do away the reproach that farmers are a stationary race of men.

The N. Y. Journal of Commerce says that one thousand five hundred and sixteen passengers arrived at that port, from foreign parts, for the week ending on Saturday last.

The N. Y. American says that there have been 28,550 passengers from foreign parts arrived at Quarantine Ground, Staten Island, since the 1st January, 1841.

The Portsmouth Washington Total Abstinence Society, which was formed and organized on the 14th of June, not one month since, now has enrolled sixteen hundred members.

The Grand Jury of Pittsburgh have presented impositions both as a crime and a great cause of crime. They also present the great number of tippling houses, the immoral character of those who keep them, and the indifference of the courts in licensing them.

Awful Effects of Intemperance.—A most horrible accident occurred last week in the county of Two Mountains, Lower Canada; a man while in a state of intoxication, having fallen into a kettle of boiling potash, and being completely dissolved! Search was made for his body, but not the least particle of it could be found.

Happy Effects of Temperance Reform in Ireland.—The following unusual information is taken from a letter written by a gentleman of Dublin to the *Lancet* Mercury.

"Our public hospitals bear abundant evidence also of the improved health of the people. I was informed lately by a young surgeon, that the want of broken limbs, etc. is severely felt, as subjects for young practitioners; also, that there is a greatly increased difficulty in getting bodies for dissection. In our largest hospitals there has been but one case of *delirium tremens* (whiskey fever) for several months past, and even that a doubtful one, although formerly it was not uncommon to have twenty or thirty at one time. Deaths from fever have much decreased."

Using up Alcohol.—The Washingtonian, having learned that Mr. Gerts, a trader in Foe street, was anxious to relinquish the sale of ardent spirits, but was not able to lose his stock on hand, went on Friday evening last, to purchase the stock of Mr. Gerts, and spill it. A committee of three was raised to carry the plan into effect. On Saturday at ten the committee assembled, and the monster was brought forth for sacrifice! At the preliminary ceremonies we have not heard.—We have no doubt they were appropriate. The Washingtonians generally do the thing in the right way.—The grand result was that the earth was saturated with rum and brandy.

"Why don't you come after cold vitals as usual," said a lady to a boy who had for a long time been a daily visitor for that species of charity. Father has joined the Temperance Society and we have warm vitals now," was the reply.

Disastrous Fire.—Waterford in Ruins!—A fire broke out at 4 o'clock on Sunday, in the village of Waterford, four miles above Troy, in a small building near the Episcopal church. It raged with the greatest fury for three hours and consumed nearly the whole of the business part of the town, including the Saratoga Co. Bank, Episcopal church, Academy, the Mansion House, formerly Donnelly's, nearly every store in the place, and about fifty dwelling houses—making in all, from seventy to eighty buildings, among which were the most valuable in the town.

It was a scene of unparalleled confusion, devastation, and distress. The whole village was covered with furniture, goods, and articles of every description. Every house appeared emptied of its contents, and the inhabitants of the village and the adjoining towns, together with many hundreds from Troy, crowded together in the neighborhood of the fire. At one time, the destruction of the bridge over the Hudson appeared inevitable, and nothing saved it but the exertions of the Troy and West Troy firemen. Waterford having but one fire engine, and that almost useless.

The whole loss is not less, probably, than \$150,000, a portion of which is insured, though we have not learned to what amount. The Fireman's Insurance Company at Albany, have lost \$60,000, to \$100,000. The Rensselaer and Saratoga of this city, and the Saratoga Mutual, and other Companies are also losers.

The cause of the fire is not known; but strong fears are entertained that it was the work of an incendiary.

Narrow Escape.—On the 19th inst., whilst a number of the students in Geneva College were bathing, one of them, a member of the Sophomore Class, Edward F. DeLaney, son of Bishop DeLaney, being somewhat exhausted, started for the shore, about eight rods distant. In coming near a boat, about half way, he began to struggle, without being able to give the alarm. Those in the boat, unable to dive for him, put an oar to his assistance, but he was too far gone. When the alarm was made, Douglas Boardman, of the Junior Class, swimming to the boat as soon as he could, dove for DeLaney, and brought him up apparently lifeless. He was carried to the shore, where, with the drawers and wrappers of the students, he was rubbed and soon resuscitated.—*Geneva Courier.*

Not to be Best.—A gentleman left this city on Wednesday evening July 7th at 5 o'clock, in the steamer *Lawrence*, son of Bishop DeLaney, being somewhat exhausted, started for the shore, about eight rods distant. In coming near a boat, about half way, he began to struggle, without being able to give the alarm. Those in the boat, unable to dive for him, put an oar to his assistance, but he was too far gone. When the alarm was made, Douglas Boardman, of the Junior Class, swimming to the boat as soon as he could, dove for DeLaney, and brought him up apparently lifeless. He was carried to the shore, where, with the drawers and wrappers of the students, he was rubbed and soon resuscitated.—*Geneva Courier.*

Cleveland to Buffalo, 15 1/2 hours
Buffalo to Rochester, 10 "
Rochester to Syracuse, 10 "
Syracuse to Albany, 12 "
Albany to New York, 11 "
New York to New Haven, 5 "
62 1/2
Cleve. Her.

The Experience of a Drunkard's Wife.

The following contains the experience of a woman who, for many years, had been afflicted with almost intolerable sufferings from being the companion of a drunkard—read at a temperance meeting held in the Second Associate Reformed Church, in Pittsburgh, June 21, 1841.

Friends,—I feel it my duty to attempt to give you the experience of the sufferings and privations of a drunkard's wife. A "Reformed Drunkard" may try to guess at the feelings of his wife, but he knows (comparatively) nothing about it. I know by sad experience of eighteen long years what they suffer.

My sufferings began at the time when, in a fit of intoxication, my husband enlisted as a soldier. Not knowing what had become of him I started through the city in search of him, and found him at the place of rendezvous. I used every means to get him discharged, but all in vain. One of the officers insisted on my going to Florida with my husband; but I considered that too gross an insult to my character, for I maintained a good one. I loved him dearly, and could not bear to see him dragged from me; for he and the infant I had were all that was dear to me in this world, having been left a desolate orphan.

Being determined to obtain his discharge by some means, I stole him away, and concealed him in the house of a friend. A band of soldiers came to the house, and with a drawn sword demanded him of me, or where he was concealed. This was a heart-rending pang, almost too great to be endured, yet I was firm to my purpose. I sent him to the country by night, then, with letters of recommendation, I started with my infant to the city of Washington, to the Secretary of War, there pleaded my own cause, and by tears and entreaties, obtained his full discharge.—returned home, paid \$15 at the place of rendezvous, and obtained permission for him to return home. This was a source of great happiness to us both; for, when sober, he was one of the best of husbands, and I loved him most tenderly. He promised to do better, but this did not continue long—he soon sunk again into all the vices of the town. Although, at his trade, he earned from \$15 to 20 a week, myself and children were often without bread to eat. I was obliged to take in work to save us from starvation, and often furnished him with bread when he failed to do it. At length he became so destitute of shame and sensibility, that he would stand in a grog shop and sell to the *fiend-like landlord* the clothes off his back; and even take mine and sell them for money to obtain drink. Like a raging maniac he would fight and quarrel abroad, and then come home and vent his spite upon me, breaking and destroying everything within his reach. Still, by tears and entreaties, I strove to prevail on him to renounce his evil practices, referred him to the example of his pious father, and endeavored to impress upon his mind the awful responsibility that rested upon him as a father to set a good example before his dear children, begging him at the same time to have compassion on me and fulfill his marriage vows. Frequently have I on my benighted knees implored his mercy, but did this move his heart to pity? No! What was his reply? "You do—! You think to coax me out of what money?" Now my respectable audience, what do you suppose were my feelings on receiving such words from him, who had solemnly promised before God and man to love, comfort, and support me all the days of my life. My heart was made of ada-

mant must it not melt at thus beholding myself a helpless victim in the hands of a merciless tyrant: having neither father nor mother, sister nor brother to fly to in the hour of despair. Often have I sat alone over a few glimmering coals till two or three o'clock, sometimes even till break of day, waiting with breathless anxiety to hear his footstep, fearing he had fallen by the hand of some ruffian, and often did I pray that God would protect him and bring him home drunk or sober, believing he would be safe while with me. Often have I sat over the bed of a dying child, for days and nights alone, while he was spending abroad what I needed at home—without one word of comfort or sympathy from him who should have shared all my griefs and sorrows, and ought to have poured the balm of consolation into my wounded heart; but alas this comfort was not for me. I bore my griefs alone, unpitied. This often caused me to become indifferent to the things around me; but on looking on my children, worse than fatherless, I was again aroused to action, tried to bear up against my trials, knowing that their support depended on my efforts. At one time, (painfully do I recollect it) I had one sick for some months; at length it partially recovered; but from the effects of the disease it was left entirely blind. During its sickness I thought my husband tried how bad he could be. Not able to work and attend the sick child, I was often without bread for those that were well, or money to get medicine for the sick one. One night while in this condition, I gave my scanty meal to my children, the last morsel in the house, I then sat down to finish some work to take home in the morning, that I might get something for breakfast; while thus employed my husband came home at midnight, demanded his supper: I had none to give him, he flew into rage, swore he would kill me—seized me, threw me across the table, breaking some of the dishes on it; seized me by my hair, and tried to bear my face upon the broken dishes; but being strong I extricated myself from his grasp; frightened almost to frenzy, I fled out of the house. I then drew near the door, and begged him to hand me the poor blind child; he snatched the tongue and made a blow at my head, swearing he would kill me. Oh! the thought of that night almost freezes the blood cold in my veins. I had the child lying on a bed under the window; he stood over it and with the tongue best out every pane of glass, and then the sashes. I stood opposite the window imploring him to give me my babe. The poor blind sufferer was crawling about over the broken glass, crying, Mamma! Mamma! while its dear little face was bleeding in several places. At length I got it out of the house, and ran away with it in my arms to one whom I thought was my friend; but, to my astonishment and grief, they refused me admittance, telling me they had often advised me to leave the vagabond, and they would do all in their power for me, but that if I would live with him I must put up with what I got. I then sat down on the steps with the poor little blind child in my lap, forsaken and forlorn, feeling as though I was entirely forsaken both by God and man. But it is in vain for me to attempt to describe my feelings. It is impossible for me to describe, or you to conceive what I felt.

After some time I returned to my house and saw the watchman take him away. I sat down to finish my work that I might get something for my children's breakfast. I never shall forget one morning when he arose, I requested him not to go from home that morning. "I have been up all night," said I, "and the child is dying." His reply was, "Dying! Hell and Damnation! she has been dying these six months, let her die and be done." On uttering these awful words he left the house, and stayed away four days. The child died accordingly that day, and what was my situation at that time. I had no clothes to lay out the corpse, nor a spot of ground to bury it in; no money to bury the dead nor to buy food for the living. I closed my house, and when the neighbors enquired how the child was, I said, no better—would not let them know it was dead—my feelings being so much wounded at my wretched situation, I was not willing that they should know it; I kept the corpse three days not knowing what to do. In the mean time I sent one of my children to search for my husband; he could not be found. In the last extremity I applied to a gentleman of my acquaintance to assist me to bury my child. He said he would, if I would promise to leave my husband. I told him if he would bury it I would work for him till I should pay for it, but I would not leave my husband: I said I had always discharged my duty as a virtuous wife, let him deviate from the path of rectitude as far as he might, I had taken him for better or worse, and was determined to enjoy the comfort of a clear conscience, which was still a source of consolation to me.

I do not disclose these facts to impress your minds with the idea that my husband was a brute, for in his sober hours he was a kind and affectionate husband and father: they are given merely to show what intemperance will make a man do, when under its baleful influence. This is, but a mere outline, but a drop out of the ocean of my sufferings which continued for eighteen years, and in all probability they would have continued to the present time, had it not been for the blessed influence of the Temperance Society, and the grace of God. I am happy to say, that for the last four years he has been a reformed man, and now we enjoy peace and plenty, friends and respectability.

Now if there is a drunkard in this assembly who has a wife, let him reflect that she too has feelings as well as I, that her heart is now wrung with anguish. Oh! pity, pity her before it is too late, do not break the heart that has confided in your support and consolation. Do not murder the innocent sufferer that has taken shelter under your protection. Now prove your part to be a man, and save yourself and the dear partner of your bosom from all the woes and all the horrors of intemperance by giving up your names.

PREMIUM FURNITURE.

MITCHELL, MOORE, & Co. Furniture and Chair Manufacturers, Citizens' Cabinet Warehouses, No. 2 Second-street, between Main and Sycamore-streets, Cincinnati. Grateful for the liberal patronage which they have received since their association as a firm, inform their friends and the public generally, that they continue to manufacture and keep constantly on hand, a general assortment of articles in their line of business. It being the desire of Mitchell, Moore & Co. to sustain their reputation, they have therefore determined to employ none but experienced workmen, and use good materials in their manufacture.

They respectfully invite their fellow-citizens who may want to purchase articles in their line of business, to call and examine their stock.

MITCHELL, MOORE & Co.
nov 27th.
Ohio Mechanic Institute.—This is to certify that Messrs Mitchell & Moore exhibited at the Third Annual Fair of the Ohio Mechanic's Institute, several specimens of Furniture, viz, a workstand, table, and a bird's-eye maple bedstead, which are adjudged to be the best work exhibited.

Given under our hand this 27th day of June, 1840.
JOHN P. FOOTY, Pres't.
L. T. WALLS, Sec'y.

CINCINNATI ENGLISH AND FRENCH ACADEMY FOR YOUNG LADIES.

MISS BLACKWELL, Principal.
The course of study comprise Reading, Writing, Sketching and the rudiments of Drawing, Arithmetic, Grammar, Ancient and Modern History and Geography, Natural and Moral Philosophy, Botany, Composition, the French language and Vocal music.

The system of instruction pursued in this Institution will secure to its pupils a sound education in the several departments of English study, and in the valuable art of outline delineation so conducive to the formation of habits of distinct and ready observation, while daily recitations and other exercises in the French by all the pupils, without exception, will offer very superior advantages to those parents who desire that their daughters should become proficient in the use of that language; and the introduction of singing in frequent alternation with the different studies during the hours of instruction, cannot fail to have a beneficial effect upon the health, spirits and voices of the students.

Young ladies residing in the Academy will receive the unremitting attention of the Principal, with regard to their health, comfort, improvement in personal deportment, and moral and intellectual progress.

The Academic year will be divided into two sessions of twenty-two weeks each, with a vacation during the months of July and August.

TERMS.

For Boarding and Tuition, \$250.00 Per Annum.
Tuition only, 50.00 yearly.
Piano, Harp or Guitar, 50.00 yearly.
Greek, Latin, Italian German, Drawing, Painting &c., on the usual terms.

FARMS AND COUNTRY SEATS FOR SALE.

A pleasant Country Seat with 9 acres of rich land situated upon a McAdams road, 3 miles from town. The improvements consist of a new house with six good rooms, a cellar and porch; also a frame stable and a cistern. This is a delightful retreat for a family during the Summer months.

A fertile Farm of 80 acres, situated 5 miles from town, with 65 acres in tillage, a frame house with four rooms and a cellar; also a log house, a frame barn, a tenant's cabin, a small orchard and a garden. The land is good, well located for cultivation, watering with springs, and fenced with posts and rails.

A fertile farm of 100 acres, located 6 miles from town, and close to a McAdams road. It has 90 acres in tillage, a good orchard of 8 acres of apple trees, a frame house with 5 rooms, a cellar and a porch, a large frame barn, a store room, a well, and several springs. The land is rich and level.

A Country Seat with 26 or 60 acres of land, situated on the Lawrenceburg road, 2 miles from town, 7 miles from town, with about one half in cultivation, an excellent new frame house built in cottage style having 4 rooms, a hall, a porch and a cellar; also a wood house, a log house, a cistern and a few fruit trees. The house stands upon a mound, and has a fine view of the river and the surrounding country.

A Country seat with 17 acres of superior land, located upon a turnpike road, 7 miles from town, with 7 acres in culture, the rest a delightful grove planted with blue grass. The improvements comprise a new frame house with 7 rooms and a hall; also a frame stable for 10 horses, a poultry yard, 2 wells, an orchard of 250 choice fruit trees, and a large garden tastefully laid out, and planted with 100 Isabella and Catawba vines.

A good farm of 100 acres, situated 7 miles from town, in a healthy region, having 60 acres in cultivation, a brick house with 9 rooms, a cellar and a porch; also 2 frame barns, a milk house, a stable, a wood house, a well and many springs; likewise 2 orchards, a garden and a yard well paved. The land is chiefly in grass, good quality and well located for tillage.

A farm of 160 acres, situated 9 miles from town, upon a turnpike road, with 60 acres in culture, a few fruit trees, 2 good wells, a spring and a log house. The land is good and favorably located for tillage.

A farm of 55 acres, situated upon a road 8 miles from town, with 40 acres in tillage; a house with six rooms, a large orchard of excellent fruit trees, a well and many springs. The land is good, well cultivated and all fenced.

A farm of 135 or 90 acres, located 10 miles from town, having 70 acres in culture, 40 fruit trees, a good stone house having 10 rooms, a cellar and 2 porches, a milk house, a frame barn and a smoke house. The land is fair quality, well watered and calculated for a Dairy Farm.

A desirable Farm of 200 acres, situated 9 miles from the Court House, with 75 acres in culture, a new house having 4 rooms, a cellar, and a porch; a good peach and apple orchards, containing from 200 to 300 choice trees; likewise a garden with quince, cherry, pear, plum, raspberry and currant trees. The land consists of rich bottom and good upland.

A fertile farm of 108 acres, situated upon a Turnpike road, 14 miles from town, having 90 acres in cultivation, an excellent frame house with 8 rooms, a cellar kitchen and two porches; a tenant's house, and extensive frame barn, a stable for 8 horses, and a large corn loft; also tools, smoke, wagon, gear, carriage and cider mill; two wells, several cisterns and many springs; also a superior orchard of choice trees, a culinary garden with many fruit trees and grape vines. The land is very rich, level, and well fenced with posts and rails, with gates for the fields. The buildings are new, well painted, laid out with a good taste and calculated for a gentleman of fortune.

A farm of three hundred acres, situated 29 miles from town, upon a good road and a canal, having 100 acres in cultivation, two apple orchards of 8 acres of grafted fruit trees, a large brick house with thirteen rooms, an extensive dining room and a cellar; also two commodious stables with lots for hay, a well, and numerous springs. The land is first and second bottom and hill. The house is now used for a tavern. There is a lock upon the premises with 10 feet fall.

A good Farm of 180 acres of level land, situated upon a road, 34 miles from town, having 90 acres in tillage, a frame cottage with 6 rooms, a hall and a cellar; also an excellent frame barn with stable, log house, a garden well fenced, and well stocked with choice vines and quince trees; likewise two orchards of choice apple, pear, cherry and peach trees, a well and several springs. The land is favorably located for tillage, the neighborhood good and salubrious.

A fertile Farm of 200 acres, located 45 miles from town, having 100 acres in tillage; a good frame house with 5 rooms, a cellar, and two porches; also a new frame porch-house, a frame barn, a stable and an orchard of bearing apple trees. The land is rich, and consists of bottom and upland. It is considered one of the best farms in the country.

A Farm of 300 acres of good land, situated upon the Ohio 75 miles from town, with 200 acres in cultivation, a young orchard of grafted apple trees, a good hewed log house, and an excellent spring. There are 200 acres of bottom and 100 of upland. It has the reputation of being an excellent farm.

A desirable Stock Farm of 508 acres, situated in Illinois, 20 miles from the Mississippi and 4 from a country town. The land consists of one half prairie, and one half arable, with 150 acres in cultivation, 2 log houses, 2 log barns, a good well, a reservoir of pure water for cattle, and an excellent orchard of 4 to 6 acres of apple, plum and peach trees. It has a large range of unfenced prairie for summer pasturage, and a thick grove near the house for winter shelter.

Farmers and Citizens who wish to dispose of their estates can, by application to me, have the advantage of an extensive advertisement of their property in English and German, both in Europe and the United States, without cost to them, unless sales be effected.

Very many other farms and Country Seats for sale; also several tracts without buildings, near and far from the City. Eligible Houses in various parts of the city for sale. Citizens and emigrants are invited to call for full information, which will be given gratis, if by letter, postage paid.

Capitalists can obtain 10 per cent. interest upon Mortgage, or the best personal security at long periods; or 8 per cent. at 10 days sight.

Persons desirous of receiving money from England, Wales, Ireland, Scotland, and other parts of Europe, can have the cash paid them in Cincinnati, as soon as the payment is advised by the English bankers. English Bills of Exchange, Gold and Bank of England Notes bought and sold.

The experience of nine years in the sale of Real Estate, enables me to furnish correct and valuable information to Emigrants.

THOMAS EMERY, Estate and Money Agent, No. 11, East Fourth St.

PETERS' PILLS.

GREAT ARRIVAL!—18 bushels, or 75,000 Boxes of Peters' Pills.—The subscriber has made arrangements with Dr. Peters, of New York, to be supplied by the quantity with his Pills. All dealers can now be supplied at New York prices.

Of all the Pills we have any knowledge of there are the most valuable. In no instance have they failed to accomplish everything they promised, and thousands who have been for years lingering with some obstinate chronic disease, now add their testimony in behalf of this valuable medicine.

Their properties as an anti-bilious and aperient medicine are unrivalled; all who use them, recommend them; their virtues surpass all eulogy and must be used to be appreciated. The weak and delicate will be strengthened by their use, not by bracing, but by removing the cause of weakness, the gross and corrupt humors of the body. They require no change in diet or care of any kind. Plain directions accompany each Box, so that every one is his own competent physician.

Dr. Peters' Vegetable Pills are in time in experimenting, with different vegetable medicines for the diseases of the liver and now offers his Vegetable Pills as the best most convenient, and cheapest medicine that can be prepared for general use.